The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXXII, No. 3 MARCH, 1950

CONTENTS

Magnificat of America . . *Francis Cardinal Spellman* 161

Some Street Shrines of Rome. Part II
Bishop John Wright 165

Mary's Co-Redemption . . . . . *A. Michel* 183

The Lord's Prayer. What Is It?
Martin E. Gounley, C.SS.R. 193

The New Hebrew Manuscripts. Part III
Edward P. Arbez, S.S. 196

The Status of St. Robert Bellarmine's Teaching about the Membership of Occult Heretics in the Catholic Church
Joseph Clifford Fenton 207

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Gestures to be Made by the Server 222

The Manual Acts at Mass 222

The Sign of the Cross at the End of Prayers . . . 223

When Assistant Deacons are not Available . . . 223

Holy Communion without Confession 224

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1950, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

The use of a Sterilizing Drug 225

The Mass and Financial Considerations 225

Parents Receiving with First Communicants 226

The New Ruling of Canon 1099 227

ANALECTA 228

BOOK REVIEWS

Maria. Études sur la Sainte Vierge, *edited by Hubert du Manoir, S.J.* 233

Manual of Solemn Ceremonies for Altar Boys, *by James J. Doherty* 236

My Catholic Faith, *by Bishop Morrow* 237

The Riches of the Missal, *by Jean Vagaggini, O.S.B.* . . . 238

BOOK NOTES 240

Special! FOR THE HOLY YEAR

- Before your visit to the Holy City acquaint yourself with the Life and Pontificate of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, by obtaining a copy of our special edition of THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, published March 1949, in honor of the 10th Anniversary of His Coronation.

- Some of the March 1949 Contents:-

Pope Pius XII: Martyr for Peace	Francis Cardinal Spellman
Pope Pius XII: Ten Years Supreme Pontiff; 50 years a Priest	Archbishop John T. McNicholas
The Cause of Pope Pius X and Devotion to the Holy See	Archbishop Richard J. Cushing
Pope Pius XII and the Missions	Bishop Thomas J. McDonnell
Pope Pius XII and the Armed Services	Msgr. Maurice S. Sheehy
Pope Pius XII and Christian Life	V. Rev. Francis J. Connell
Pope Pius XII and Education	Rev. James A. Magner
Pope Pius XII and the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine	Rev. Joseph B. Collins

NO PRIEST OR SEMINARIAN SHOULD BE WITHOUT

Price: $1.00 Postpaid (U. S., Canada, Foreign)
(We reserve the right to limit copies)

Orders for gift copies accepted.

ORDER NOW! Only a limited number of copies left.

- On all new or gift subscriptions to THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW at the regular subscription price of $5.00 ($3.50 for Seminarians) we offer a special price of 50 cents per copy for the Commemorative Issue, while they last.

Address Orders to:

THE AMERICAN ECCLESASTICAL REVIEW

The Catholic Univeristy of America Washington 17, D. C.

In answering advertisements please mention THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

Magnificat of America

I

America, Our America!
Thou art not alone,
Nor can'st thou ever be,
Helpless and hopeless,
The prey of fears within,
The pawn of plots without,
Amid the tumult of nations,
Wandering like homeless waves,
Roaring like hungry winds,
Breaking against thy coasts,
Spirits of the vasty deeps,
Leaping to rend thee.

America, Our America!
Thou art not lonely,
Nor can'st thou ever be.
Thine eyes look to the hills
Untroubled against the sky,
Whence help shall come,
Aglow with radiant light,
Itself the shining shadow
Of the matchless Vision
That companies thee always
In places dark with death,
In hours weary with wars.

America, Our America!
Thou art not lonesome,
Nor can'st thou ever be.
The Vision is thy sentinel,
Circling thy borders,
Guarding thy threshold,
Shedding rare light
That is life itself—
The life that lives on love,
The Voice ever beating out
On hearts, the Song of Songs,
On souls, the Song of Service.

II

America, Our America!
Lift up thine eyes and see
Mary is thy Patroness.
High in the sky,
Over land and sea,
The Sign of the Woman appears—
Clothed with the sun,
The moon her footstool,
Her crown twelve stars—
'Neath her writhes the dragon,
Ancient demon of evil,
Spawner of discords and hatreds.

America, Our America!
Thy heart stirs within thee—
The Woman is thy Mother.
Awaiting deliverance.
The Vision travails in labor
Expecting a son.
Sharp are the pangs,
Sharpening with the hours,
Till stayed by thy voice,
Thine infant voice,
Calling her Mother.
Calling her Patroness.

America, Our America!
Banish doubts and fears.
Thy Mother is our hope,
More mighty she than statesmen
With their bluff and brawl,
Bartering lives away.
Thy Mother is our Power,
More potent she than hostile hordes,
Drawn up in battle-array.
Mary is God's Spirit-shrine,
Whence all blessings flow
Prospering thee in goodness.

III

America, Our America!
With dignity all sublime
Thou art dedicated to Mary.
Mother Church gave thee to Mary;
Mother Mary gave thee to Christ.
It is thee Christ gives to the world,
To be a Savior to the nations,
To be servant to God,
To be son to her.
As Mother, so son,
Walking her ways,
Working her wonders.

America, Our America!
With duty all sublime
Thou art consecrated to Mary.
Her mission is through thee.
She feeds with thy hand;
She soothes with thy touch;
She frees with thy strength,
Giving homes through thee,
Spreading joy through thee,
Lighting through thy light,
Bringing hope through thy hope,
Giving love through thy love.

America, Our America!
With destiny all sublime
Thou art predestined through Mary.
Through Mary, God chose thee,
Sealing thee for greatness,
Watching thee with care,
Entrusting thee with peoples—
Brave, hardy peoples,
Champions of freedom.
Bright dawns thy destiny.
Nearer draws the harbor
With Mary for thy Star.

IV

America, Our America!
Hold fast to the Vision of Mary,
Mary Immaculate.
Her glory fills the earth,
She is of our race
Its "solitary boast."
She, alone without sin,
Keeps the gloom of wrath from thee,
Who art defending her glory.
She, Conqueror of evil,
Conquers evil for thee,
Thou who art ever striving for Good!

America, Our America!
Pray always to Mary,
Mary Immaculate.
She, Mother to nations—
The Mother of Christ,
The Lord of all nations;
She guards them and guides them,
Subduing their hates,
Inspiring their spirits;
Mourning for prodigals,
As childless mothers mourn
Torn by their treasons.

America, Our America!
Give thy heart to Mary,
Mary Immaculate.
Join in her prayer of praise,
All Heaven attending,
For our land that is free.
Sing thou her song of joy,
All nations listening,
Giving thanks to God.
Sing thou the song of thy soul,
The Magnificat of Mary,
The Magnificat of America!

FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN

SOME STREET SHRINES OF ROME

PART II

In visiting Rome during Holy Year or in reflecting *in absentia* on the Eternal City, one can hardly do better than follow the order of F. Marion Crawford's chapters in *Ave Roma Immortalis* where the fourteen regions (*rioni, regiones*) of Rome provide the sequence of the book. Crawford writes:

> Here and there, in out-of-the-way places, overlooked in the modern rage for improvement, little marble tablets are set into the walls of old houses, bearing semi-heraldic devices such as a Crescent, a Column, a Griffin, a Stag, a Wheel and the like. Italian heraldry has always been eccentric, and has shown a tendency to display all sorts of strange things, such as comets, trees, landscapes and buildings in the escutcheon, and it would naturally occur to the stranger that the small marble shields, still visible here and there at the corners of old streets, must be the coats of arms of Roman families that held property in that particular neighborhood. But this is not the case. They are the distinctive devices of the Fourteen Rioni, or wards, into which the city was divided, with occasional modifications, from the time of Augustus to the coming of Victor Emmanuel, and which with some further changes survive to the present day. The tablets themselves were put up by Pope Benedict the Fourteenth, who reigned from 1740 to 1758, and who finally brought them up to the ancient number of fourteen; but from the dark ages the devices themselves were borne upon flags on all public occasions by the people of the different "Regions."

The *rioni* have played a principal part in the history and life of Rome, therefore, and correspond to something with deep roots and meaning in the *mores* of the Roman people. The modern development of the City has resulted in the addition of further regions to the traditional fourteen, and these, too, we must visit if our pilgrimage to the street shrines of Rome is to be complete.

But first of all it may be well to name the ancient *rioni,* indicating the numbers traditionally assigned to each:

I. Monti
II. Trevi
III. Colonna
IV. Campo Marzo
V. Ponte
VI. Parione
VII. Regola
VIII. Sant'Eustachio
IX. Pigna
X. Campitelli
XI. Sant'Angelo
XII. Ripa
XIII. Trastevere
XIV. Borgo

The street shrines of Rome are found in greatest number in these sections, but some interesting shrines may also be admired in the later sections of the City: Prati, Esquilino, Ludovisi, Celio, S. Saba, Castro Pretorio, Testaccio and Sallustiano.

In his *Edicole di fede e de pietà nelle vie di Roma* which is the the principal source of these present notes, Publio Parsi enumerates some 530 street shrines, distributed among the Roman districts, ancient and modern, as follows: Trastevere 86; Monti 52; Parione 41; Ponte 37; Campo Marzo 32; Colonna 33; Campitelli 34; Regola 32; Trevi 24; S. Eustachio 24; Pigna 21; Borgo 18; Ripa 14; Prati 13; Esquilino 11; Ludovisi 9; Celio 9; S. Saba 10; S. Angelo 7; Castro Pretorio 7; Testaccio 6; Tiburtino 4; Sallustiano 2; Trionfale 2; Salario 2.

It will be noted that the fourteen more ancient districts, with the sole exception of Sant' Angelo, lead all the others in the numbers of their shrines. The relatively small number of those erected in Sant' Angelo is readily explained when we recall that the name of this district has nothing to do with the castle or the bridge, but is derived from the church of the "Holy Angel in Fish Market," in the heart of the old Ghetto.

If we begin our pilgrimage in the vast Monti section we are immediately reminded of the intensely *popular* origins of the Roman street shrines. The broad main streets of Monti were laid out in their present plan toward the end of the nineteenth century when there prevailed in Rome both a patriotism and a cosmopolitanism alien to those so long native to the Eternal City. The very names of Via Cavour and Via dell' Impero suffice to recall alike the recent history of the region and the changes of mood introduced by it.

Accordingly, it is through side streets, back streets and even alleys that we must wander if we are to find either the people of Monti or the evidences of their devotion.

The neighborhood to the rear of St. John Lateran and particularly the narrow streets descending from the Lateran Hospital include many typical baroque shrines of the seventeenth century, as do also the crowded lanes around *Madonna dei Monti* and *S. Agata de' Goti.*

But perhaps the most appropriate shrine in Monti to single out for special comment is at the end of Via Baccina in the direction

of Arco dei Pantani where we find ourselves before a poverty-stricken shrine which once knew days of greater splendor. In 1853 Rufini's book on Roman street shrines described this shrine:

Near the building marked no. 1, belonging to Antonio Grassi, one notices a baldacchino of wood covered with lead, with pictures representing the Eternal Father and some cherubim and seraphim. This overlays a small marble temple, upheld by two columns, in the midst of which is a fresco of the Blessed Virgin with the Child on her knees, and the inscription, "Purissimo Dei Genitricis cordi quod mens nostra amoris vulnere icta auspirat." A marble kneeler is in front of it; it features a sculptured sunburst, the center of which reproduces a heart with two kneeling seraphim at its sides, with the inscription: "The devotees of the Blessed Virgin of the Good Heart, 1838." A sea shell of marble for holy water may still be seen at one side. A tablet on the wall contains 89 silver tokens and there are 8 smaller tablets with records of graces received from God through the intercession of the miraculous image. The following inscription bears witness to the public devotion to Mary and of the spiritual treasures with which the Church wished to enrich her shrine: "His Holiness, Pius VI, by decree of February 28, 1797, grants to all the faithful of both sexes an indulgence of 200 days, applicable also to the souls in Purgatory, each time they devoutly and with hearts at least contrite recite the Litany of the Blessed Virgin before this sacred image."

Now all this spiritual grandeur has disappeared. Nothing remains but a simple, modern frame around a ruined, retouched fresco; everything else has been corroded by neglect and by dampness. The face of the Madonna may still be discerned. It is turned slightly downward; the expression is thoughtful, and her Child, his head on the Virgin's shoulder, turns toward the observer. The design is good, revealing the capable hand of a talented artist, probably of the end of the sixteenth century. Many *ex-voti* still adorn the shrine. A bare electric bulb illumines one side and a few dry flowers add a pathetic touch. Beneath it there still survive two inscriptions: that of 1838, which recalls the restoration, and that of 1797 regarding the indulgences granted by Pope Pius VI.

In 1796 this image became the object of unusual public demonstrations following certain singular events which took place here on July 9 at the same time that a strange movement of the eyes was observed at other street shrines in the City. At this image of Our Lady, called *La Madonna dell' Arco dei Pantani,* some

lilies had been attached to the wall, and these, because of the length of the season and the constant beating down of the burning sun, had become dry branches, bare of every leaf and blossom. Suddenly it was observed that from these bunches of dry twigs, three green clusters or natural buds, like those from which a lily flowers, had bloomed on the left side; another like them was seen to be budding on the other side. The four blossoms remained fresh not for days, but for months, flourishing under the torrid July sun. The people became convinced that this was a supernatural sign exceeding any natural explanation, and as a result there followed repeated gatherings of crowds and a fervor in prayer before this shrine which were almost incredible.

Reference has already been made at least twice in these notes to seemingly miraculous phenomena in the case of certain of the *madonnelle* of Rome in July, 1796. In all, some twenty-six street shrines have been the objects of ecclesiastical investigation with consequent declarations of the authenticity of the claims popularly made in their regard. Numerous others, similarly acclaimed by the populace, never received such official recognition. Noteworthy in connection with these prodigies is a decree of the Cardinal Vicar of the City dated Feb. 28, 1797, which reveals the details of a careful canonical investigation conducted by Cardinal della Somaglia and his notary, Francesco Mari, into the claims of more than 86 witnesses who alleged that they had personally witnessed the wond'rous evidence. The Decree of Approbation carefully notes that the investigations conducted by the Vicariate had not reached any conclusion with regard to some of the cases submitted, but it described the remarkable phenomena as having been "abundantly and more than abundantly confirmed" by the evidence submitted with respect to the following twenty-six images:

Madonna dell'Archetto
Addolorata degli Agonizzanti
Madonna nel vicolo delle Bollette
Madonna nel palazzo dell'Impresa Vecchia
Addolorata presso S. Andrea della Valle
Immacolata a S. Nicola de' Lorenesi
Addolorata presso la Chiesa Nuova
SSmo Crocifisso in casa Pucci
Immacolata a S. Silvestro in Capite
Madonna del Cenacolo in S. Silvestro in Capite

Assunta alla Chiesa Nuova
Madonna della Lampada in S. Giovanni Calibita
Madonna delle Grazie in S. Maria della Consolazione
Madonna in Piazza dell'Olmo
Madonna del Rosario in casa Galli
Madonna sotto l'Arco di Grotta Pinta
Madonna del Carmine a S. Martino ai Monti
Madonna del Carmine nella cappella interna del Noviziato
SSmo Crocifisso in S. Giovanni in Ayno (now at *Ss. Benedetto e Scolastica* in Via Torre Argentina)
Madonna del Rosario all'Arco della Ciambella
Madonna al Palazzo Odescalchi
Madonna sotto il Palazzo della Consulta
Madonna in case Bolognetti
Addolorata in Piazza Madama (now in the Church of S. Luigi de Francesi)
Madonna di Guadalupe in S. Nicola in Carcere
Addolorata in Piazza del Gesù

In the heart of Trevi we find one of the shrines identified with this extraordinary history. In point of fact, two of the effigies most heralded by the Roman people in 1796 as instruments of divine wonders are found in Trevi. One of these, the *Madonna dell' Archetto* is now housed in a graceful chapel of its own and is no longer properly speaking a "street shrine." The other was the once greatly beloved *Madonna del vicolo delle Bollette.*

The shrine is now in a very neglected condition. A baldacchino with hangings protects a simple square wooden frame, which encloses the image. A small marble shelf beneath it is crowded with vases of flowers; a candlestick emerges from them and holds a lighted bulb.

The painting is a worthy eighteenth century canvas representing Our Lady in a mantle with large folds, her hands crossed on her breast and her eyes turned heavenward. Her face has an ecstatic expression, but the baroque artistry reflects scant spiritual insight. The rich colors impress the observer and give the shrine a strange fascination. A great many *ex-voti,* strings of coral, bracelets and other votive offerings adorn the image. The shrine was once the property of a certain Domenico Bertagna, a kettle-maker in the Via delle Muratte.

Under the picture one finds the following inscription in stone: "Die IX Iulii 1796—Posuit oculum suum super corda illorum ostendere illis magnalia operum Suorum." This commemorates the events which give this shrine a special place, together with the other twenty-five, among the *madonnelle* of Rome.

The first witness at the eventual process of authentication was the Marquis Del Bufalo, who, on his way to the Via dell' Archetto to see the amazing things reported as taking place there, had met the Marchioness Barbara Palombara Massimi. She told him of other prodigies announced in the Vicolo delle Muratte and advised him to go there quickly since it was not yet crowded and so that he might the more easily verify what was happening.

Del Bufalo's testimony is echoed in the contemporary chronicles:

> The pupils of both the eyes of the image moved and turned upward, so that little by little, very slowly, they became almost totally hidden under the upper eyelids. Then with the same slow movements they were lowered. This motion was so frequent that in the space of a quarter of an hour Del Bufalo and the others present saw it repeated several times, the crowd meanwhile shouting, "Evviva Maria." "Look, she is moving her eyes!" and the like. Another time, as though animated, the eyes moved from one side to another almost as if to survey lovingly the bystanders and show that Mary heard with pleasure the praises which they were giving her. Other witnesses testified to having seen the eyes close completely and open again shortly after.

The records of the process show that these phenomena occurred continually until Nov. 25 of that same year and that the glass in front of the image was frequently removed to dispel the least suspicion of optical illusion.

In the disorders of 1853 this shrine had less edifying history. The image suffered vandalism on the night of June 15 when its glass protecting cover was shattered and the image was robbed of the votive gifts which adorned it. As soon as the inhabitants of the vicinity discovered the sacrilege, they not only decided to adorn the image with other jewels, but they restored the shrine completely. In reparation for the outrage, the image was carried in procession to the nearby church of *S. Maria in Via* where a solemn triduum was held. It was then returned to its street shrine "with great display of lights and crowds of people."

There are more than a score other street shrines in the crowded Trevi section. Nearby, the Colonna region rejoices in more than thirty, of which perhaps the best known of those dedicated to the Madonna is that found where the Via dei Cappuccini crosses the Via della Purificazione. Here we find a tabernacle very modest in physical fabric but enriched by much popular devotion. A small roof protects a poor wooden frame, which contains a venerated image of the Blessed Virgin with her Divine Son. The child stands on Mary's knee and holds in one hand a cross which rests upon His shoulder. The painting, done in the eighteenth century, is in no way exceptional, but numberless *ex-voti* of every kind reveal the spiritual indebtedness of the Roman people to this shrine, more significant in its poverty than many artistically more notable objects of devotion.

Less than a century ago the Campo Marzo region numbered fully a hundred street shrines. No section of modern Rome has seen so much reconstruction, however, with a consequent destruction of innumerable older houses, narrow streets and now forgotten little squares. With the passing of these, Rome lost more than three score *madonnelle* in Campo Marzo alone.

Of the more than thirty shrines remaining, several of the best are in Via del Babuino. Perhaps the most conspicuous, however, is the shrine in Via S. Sebastianello beyond Piazza di Spagna and along the wall under the Pincio.

Here on the high wall we find an unusual shrine, composed of elements of different epochs resulting in a very interesting whole. A modern frame in Renaissance style surrounds a square niche, to the back of which is attached a piece of sixteenth century sculpture. It is a matronly figure of the Blessed Mother holding the Divine Child in her arms. It is sculptured by the strong, sure hands of a capable artist, a follower of Sansovino. On the border of the frame is carved the salutation "Ave Maria," and to one side is a strange detail, a miniature Venetian balcony, delicately carved to serve as a flower vase. Some small pictures and *ex-voti* surround the image and an iron arm upholds a votive lamp.

Unlike Campo Marzo, Ponte tenaciously retains its ancient picturesque character and among its thirty-seven street shrines one particularly deserves notice. It is one of a half dozen or so shrines in Via dei Coronari and rises imposingly on stone blocks at the

corner of Vicolo Domizio. Two columns with artificial capitals uphold a triangular architrave, in the frieze of which is the inscription: "Instaurata fuit quam cernis Pontis Imago," while the base reads: "Albertus Serra de Monte Ferrato." Simple and classic in its severe lines, the work is accredited to Antonio da Sangallo, who designed it in the first half of the sixteenth century at the order of Cardinal Alberto Serra di Monferrato. Sangallo, according to Vasari, chose Perin del Vaga to paint the picture, the "Imago Pontis," on the interior wall of the niche. This was undoubtedly a substitution for a more ancient image of which records speak as far back as 1463.

The painting by Perin del Vaga, representing the Coronation of the Virgin, is now almost completely obliterated. Through the withe which protects it there may be faintly glimpsed the faded traces of the figures of the Redeemer and Our Lady and other confused traces of color. A gilded frame surrounds the almost totally lost painting. Above, over the shrine, window frames and escutcheons contribute to a general scene of remarkable artistic interest.

Parione offers several noteworthy public shrines, most familiar of which are doubtless those of *S. Maria dell' Anima* and the elaborate, monumental shrine of Piazza dell' Orologio. But of its two score shrines the most "popular" is quite probably that on the side of the archway which opens on the street along the side of the church of *S. Maria in Vallicella*. Here one finds a wooden tabernacle in the form of a square niche with a grilled door and a frame surmounted by a baldacchino-like crown. Two heads of cherubim soar above the figure. Another is under the shrine; two angels float on clouds at the sides. In the niche itself is a canvas representing Christ Crucified between Our Lady and St. John, a mediocre painting of the end of the eighteenth century or the beginning of the nineteenth. But to the fore is a charming sixteenth century group in carved wood, with a polychrome statue of Mary. The Blessed Virgin extends her arms to open her mantle and enfold it on three religious, seen in prayer at her feet. Her eyes are lowered, the expression of her face is almost a smile. A silver crown reposes on her head and about the shrine there are vases of flowers and many *ex-voti*.

At one time this tabernacle must have been on the opposite side of the arch, where a marble tablet may still be seen with the inscription: "Alms of those devoted to Mary." Perhaps the image was transferred after a miracle attributed to this shrine, too, on the fated Saturday which was July 9, 1796. The chronicle records:

> The sacred eyelids, which the artist had carved as lowered, slowly lifted in the same manner as human eyes when a person opens them. And this opening was so much more evident and marvelous that in its case the whole eyeball was uncovered and the entire pupil acquired a certain brightness and—as others said—an extraordinary sparkle resembling the brightness of the eye of a healthy, vivacious person. The movement, repeated several times in a short while, was slow and steady; the eyes as they were uncovered, acquiring the gleam of a gem struck by light.

So great was the impression produced by this extraordinary event that a young worker, affected by what he had seen, fell on his knees, crying: "Ah, Holy Mother, you have saved my soul! Without this tomorrow I might have been in the depths of Hell!"

Of some twenty-five shrines in the streets of Regola (including one of singularly imposing proportions enshrining the emblem of the Monte di Pieta, the image of our Blessed Redeemer, and dominating Piazza del Monte di Pieta), the one which Parsi describes as "spiritually most important" is in Via dei Cappellari not far from Piazza Campo de Fiori.

It is an eighteenth century tabernacle, surrounded by ornamental detail in plaster, reproducing in bas-relief garlands of flowers, lilies, leaves and shells. The work is not remarkable, but the total impression is pleasing. The painting, representing the Blessed Virgin, is very faded, but it is surrounded by many *ex-voti* which appear to be constantly augmented. On a small stone slab beneath appear the words: "Tota pulchra es et macula non est in te." Fr. Francesco Baldissoni and other witnesses asserted that on the famed July 9, 1796, the sacred image opened and closed its eyes many times and continued to move them for several days. No process of authentication was undertaken in the case of this shrine, however.

The most important Marian shrine of the S. Eustachio section is situated on the facade of a private home in Piazza della Rotonda. It is an eighteenth century fresco of large proportions, surrounded by a baroque frame with plaster spiral curves and surmounted by

a dove, the symbol of the Holy Ghost, on a sunburst. The painting represents the Immaculate Conception. Portraying her arms crossed on her breast and her glance lowered, the image of Mary has something almost "aerial" about it, pervaded as it is by a quality of movement lent it by the flowing of the mantle, widening at the bottom in large swirls and seeming to lift the figure into space. A winged angel leans toward Mary, while other heads of angels make a crown for her. Unfortunately, the picture is now somewhat faded and its colors are no longer clear, though one still senses the original beauty of the painting.

Two of the images authenticated with reference to the prodigies of July, 1796, are still venerated in the Pigna section. In Via dell'Arco della Ciambella are the ruins of the Terme di Agrippa, on the pagan walls of which, as if to redeem them and to testify to the triumph of Christianity, was erected a sacred shrine dedicated to the Blessed Virgin. Apart from its interesting history, this shrine has the most valuable artistic merit of the street shrines in Pigna.

A sixteenth century marble tabernacle, composed of two pilasters with composite capitals supporting an architrave, rests on an altar-like marble table supported by two brackets trimmed with acanthus leaves. Between the two brackets there is a head of a cherub. The pilasters and the architrave are decorated with floral and ornamental detail sculptured in bas-relief. Inside the tabernacle is a marble frame with a small head of an angel in its center. This, in turn, encloses a smaller gilded frame, within which is the image of Our Lady. The tabernacle is surmounted by two plaster angels holding a crown of flowers and by a huge wooden baldacchino. On the bottom part is a marble slab on which another image of Mary is sculptured with the following inscription: "He who ponders and meditates on your mysteries, O Blessed Virgin, lifts to you chaste thoughts, and you enkindle love in his soul the while he innocently offers his heart." A marble kneeler is attached to the altar and the latter is modestly furnished: wooden candlesticks, vases with flowers, and two lanterns, held by iron brackets, burn constantly.

The shrine was completed toward the end of the eighteenth century by the Capparucci family which for more than a century had inhabited a house nearby. They re-fashioned in tabernacle form an

ornamental frame which the Capparucci themselves, who were stonecutters by profession, had perhaps owned. The lovely frame, worked with elegant borders of the sixteenth century, must have been executed by a competent artist.

In older times the shrine protected a canvas of the Madonna of the Rosary, restored in 1830 by the painter Marcucci. This was another image which in 1796 produced the prodigy of the movement of the eyes. The chronicle declares concerning it:

A fine artist, who was devoted to the image and had taken care of it for a long time having heard on July ninth of the prodigies that were being manifested at other shrines, left his carving shop, located nearby, to observe one of the marvels. Passing in front of this shrine, he noticed a spiderweb on the front of it and, taking a ladder, climbed up to clean the glass with his handkerchief. Another person standing below, suddenly called his attention to evidence of a miracle, which he observed, in the form of the opening and closing of Mary's eyes. And in fact, looking at the left eye, which is turned on the Child, instead of seeing it opened, as it is always, he saw it completely closed, the upper lid having fallen on the lower. Recitations of the Litany, weeping and shouting from the spectators, the arrival of a crowd of more than two hundred persons, happened in a flash. And all became witnesses of the prodigy, which was repeated time and again: the eyelids of both eyes of the Virgin, lowering with slow motion, showed a perfect closing, so that the entire eyeball, the white as well as the dark part of the pupil, was covered; and after remaining so for the space of an "Ave Maria," they opened with more rapid motion than that with which they closed. From two o'clock that first morning, until late into the night, it continued that way, and on the following days, at least, for the three weeks of which there was written evidence at the process, the applauding people invoked and attested to that same amazing closing and opening of the sacred eyes. His Excellency, Duke Lante was one of those who checked the more carefully by climbing a ladder which had been left at the shrine for that purpose, as did the lawyer Celestini. At close range they were able to witness repeatedly the remarkable portent. They also saw very plainly, the eyeball move, with the pupil shifting from side to side, as if to look at the bystanders, and then clearly rise and lower; the face became beautiful and life-like in that heavenly motion.

It is easy to imagine with what jealous solicitude the image was tended by the Capparucci family, who, besides beautifying the shrine, kept a light always burning before it and on the first Sun-

day in October celebrated a solemn feast there, decorating the shrine and the street around it with hangings of myrtle and of lights.

In 1873 the miraculous image was robbed of its *ex-voti* by sacrilegious hands, and from that time on, for fear of other acts of the vandalism common in that period, the Capparucci family removed the painting from the shrine every evening, substituting a slab with the name of Mary inscribed on it. When they later moved to another location, they carried the image away with them, leaving the shrine abandoned. A carpenter of the neighborhood, in order to fill the empty space, engaged the painter Pietro Campofiorito to make another copy of the ancient Madonna, and this was placed in the shrine some time in December, 1895.

The neighborhood around the church of *S. Maria in Campitelli* is rich in shrines. Indeed, many houses are decorated with the *maiolica* polychrome discs which commemorate the celebration throughout Campitelli in 1924 of the fourteenth centenary of the apparition of Mary to a Roman patrician woman who was feeding the poor at her palace gate. On every side the walls of houses are imbedded with these miniature shrines recalling the visit of "S. Maria in Portico."

Of the numerous notable street shrines in Campitelli, one particularly attracts us with its tabernacle, pictures and inscriptions covering the entire outer curve of the apse of the church of *S. Maria della Consolazione.* It commemorates the deliverance of the City from pestilence in 1658.

The principal figure is modelled on that of a woman of the people, with large eyes and imposing appearance. The Child in her lap lifts his arm in a gesture of benediction. It is a seventeenth century painting and is executed with a bold brush in almost sculptural relief.

The image is enclosed in a marble baroque frame on which is inscribed, "Consolatrix Afflictorum—Anno Salutis 1658." The tabernacle is surmounted by a wooden baldacchino and surrounded by clouds painted on the wall from which heads of cherubim emerge and a large sunburst radiates. Under the frame is a stone tablet held up by several iron spiral curves.

On a small stone is the inscription, "Redemptori ac Sanctissimae

Eius Genitrici Mariae Urbe e Pestilentia Liberata Gloria Sempiterna."

Below this was placed in 1787 one of those admonitory inscriptions which in their forthright simplicity reveal the homely faith of the Roman people: "Pause here, passerby, and bow your head humbly! Here is the Source of Graces; this is the Mother of God. Look at Her, weep, and pray,—for She does not refuse graces to those devoted to Her."

The *rione* S. Angelo includes the ancient Ghetto of the Roman Jews. Most mysterious of its labyrinth of streets and alleys is the Via delle Botteghe Oscure. A private dwelling on the corner between the Caetani Palace and the Piazza Paganica displays the modest shrine of another of the twenty-six "miraculous" images of 1796.

Meager in proportions, the shrine is bare of ornamental display. To its simplicity, however, there is added a touch of eighteenth century elegance which makes it especially attractive. Under the picture there are two lilies of plaster entwined and tied by a ribbon of the same unfortunate material. The base of the tabernacle is formed by a bracket, also of plaster, with an inscription on the front which curves over the sides: "Mater Providentiae." A baldacchino of iron plate surmounts the shrine. The painting represents the Blessed Virgin at half bust with her hands on her breast and her eyes lowered, and is a work of the eighteenth century. The workmanship is quite fine, especially in the delicate manner in which the features of the face are suffused with truly celestial sweetness.

Below, embedded in the wall is a large marble tablet on which is inscribed the following:

I. H. S.
QUAM VENERARIS IMAGO
CUM SEPT. ID. IUL. AN. CI 1796
VARIO OCULORUM MOTU PROPITIO ASPECTU
SUPPLICEM POPULUM REFICERET
OMNIUM CORDA SIBI DEMERUIT ET EX CORDE LAUDES
HOC AMOR M. P.

A number of contemporary shrines, chiefly fashioned of ceramic, bring refreshing color to the modern residential sections of Ripa, especially the streets sloping down the Aventine toward Via del

Mare from Piazza S. Anselmo and the noble Piazza dei Cavalieri di Malta. But it is to Tiber Island that we must turn for the most venerable of the street shrines of Ripa.

Just beyond the pharmacy of the Hospital of the Brothers of St. John of God we see a wooden tabernacle containing a recent reproduction of a very old miraculous image of *Santa Maria Cantu-Fluminis,* popularly called *La Madonna della Lampada.* The original was painted around 1290, and is still venerated at the first altar on the right in the adjoining church of *S. Giovanni Calabita.* The popular name, "della Lampada" seems to come from a miracle worked in 1557, when the image, at that time in a small niche near the river, was submerged by the waters of the Tiber without being harmed, in fact without its lamp being extinguished.

For the many miracles associated with it, the image was crowned by the Vatican Chapter on March 19, 1664. On July 9, 1796, it was one of the images reported to have opened its eyes and moved them toward the people. It is among the twenty-six images approved after the canonical examination into the alleged incidents.

The overcrowded workers' quarters of Trastevere are by all odds the most generously provided with these outdoor evidences of Roman faith and popular fervor. More than four score street shrines, ranging from humble images to ornate public altars, may be found in the *rione.* Most remarkable is the facade of a small house in Via dei Cascellari, entirely taken up by an imposing shrine in neo-classic style. A large baldacchino in the form of a cupola covers a marble tabernacle constructed of two columns resting on a bracket and holding a triangular architrave. In the center there is a nineteenth century painting of Our Lady with the Child surrounded by several saints. On the border of the frame an inscription reads: "Mother of Providence, pray for us."

Last of the traditional *rioni,* Borgo lost several of her best known shrines when the *spina* was demolished just over a decade ago. The remaining street shrines, if of lesser artistic merit, are nonetheless the objects of that even greater piety which we instinctively expect in the shadow of St. Peter's cupola.

As soon as we pass the Porta di S. Spirito, near a secondary entrance to the hospital, we find in Via dei Penitenzieri the most notable shrine of this section. It is a baroque tabernacle of marble, severe in its lines. Under its bracket there is a charming angel

head, with festoons and the inscription: "Anno Dni 1665." The central image is a good, though somewhat highly colored painting of the Blessed Virgin in large proportions, her hands crossed on her breast and her gaze turned upward. On the frame is the inscription: "Sub tuum praesidium." Many *ex-voti* surround the image. A small lamp hangs from a wrought iron bracket and on the altar before the shrine there is a constant renewal of fresh flowers from the hospital staff and relatives of the sick. It is one of the most touching focal points of Roman devotion.

Of the more modern *rioni* and their public shrines little need be noted. The shrines themselves are less numerous and, of course, almost completely contemporary in their inspiration. Most, though not all, are on buildings housing religious orders or institutions. However, typical of the shrines in the Esquiline region is one near 161 Via Merulana in the low wall which borders the sidewalk. A wide square niche, enclosed by a grille and surrounded by a plaster frame, protects a nineteenth century canvas of the *Madonna del Carmelo*. Around it are numerous "holy pictures" of all sizes and styles, together with *ex-voti* and a profusion of flowers, all revealing the popular veneration in which the image is locally held.

There are about nine shrines in the fashionable Ludovisi section. Noteworthy is a lovely nineteenth century medallion in marble, surrounded by heads of angels. It is located on the corner of Via Emilia and Via Lazio. In its center is a gracious Madonna with the Holy Child in her arms, delicately sculptured. Before it there is a lamp of wrought iron.

Much admired in the *rione* Sallustiano is a modern sculptured shrine on the corner of Via Quintino Sella and Via Flavia. It reproduces a charming Madonna with the Child in her arms. On its marble base is the inscription: "Beata Mater."

A modern business district, lining the Via Nazionale, cuts through the *rione* Castro Pretorio. The street shrines of this district are therefore few and, on the whole, not impressive. Perhaps the most attractive is a modern medallion with a frame decorated with angel heads at the corner of Via Nazionale and Via Torino. It supports a delicate sculpture representing Our Lady and the Divine Child. An arm of wrought iron holds a small

lamp which casts a benign light on the strolling couples of this least Roman of streets.

The Celian region has several interesting shrines, again particularly in the older streets as Via della Navicella and Via di S. Stefano Rotondo. There is a baroque shrine of the Redeemer in Piazza dei SS. Giovanni e Paolo and another of Saint Gregory the Great not far away. Best known of the *madonnelle* in this section is in Via della Valle delle Camene, a chapel-like shrine encased at the top of the wall surrounding a private property. Through a barred window one may glimpse a small interior damaged by time and dampness. In the midst of candle-holders and *ex-voti* on the altar is a sixteenth century fresco of Our Lady of Good Counsel. On one side of a window there is a tablet with the following inscription: "Whoever prays before this image will gain 100 days indulgence, by decree of His Holiness Pius VII, July 13, 1803." The same inscription appears on a marble tablet across the front of the little chapel.

Almost all the street shrines of Testaccio are modern reproductions of the very ancient venerated image of *S. Maria Liberatrice*. Some of them have been erected in the last two decades. Typical is a beautiful baroque shrine at the corner of Via Galileo Ferraris and Via Beniamino Franklin. The central medallion is surmounted by charming heads of angels under an arch, while below there are lilies entwined in spirals about a slab with the inscription: "S. Maria Liberatrice." The picture in the medallion is a reproduction of the original image so much loved in the region and was painted on canvas about twenty years ago by Prof. Capanni.

The front of a small house situated between the two archways of the Porta S. Paolo in the San Saba region is decorated with two identical shrines decorated with the heads of cherubim and entwined lilies. The plaster parts are well sculptured and although the frescoes are now badly faded, one still notices their skillful design and the warmth which enlivens them. One represents the Annunciation; the other, the Blessed Virgin with her Child and a saint in prayer before them.

The vast majority of the public shrines of the Prati streets are modern *maiolica*, imitations in most cases of della Robbia type medallions. On the Via Vittoria Colonna, however, near the

Lungotevere dei Mellini there is a charming marble image of the Virgin and Child, done in bas-relief.

Not at all to be compared with the shrines in the public thorofares of the *rioni* of Rome are the half dozen or so shrines to be found in the so-called *quartieri* of the modern City: Salario, Tiburtino, and Trionfale. A certain antique charm still hovers about a Madonna of Good Counsel at the corner of Via Candia and Via Leone IV in Trionfale; it dates from the seventeenth century and is one of the two shrines in the quarter. Tiburtino offers four shrines, the best a "Salve Regina" of the 1800's in Piazzale Franco Baldini.

Greatest of the shrines in the *quartieri* and majestic among all the public shrines of Rome is the glittering mosaic of the regally enthroned Madonna who looks out along the Via Nomentana from the lofty wall of Porta Pia. Her princely Child holds the globe in one hand the while He blesses with the other. Originally a painting by Capparoni (1831-1907), commissioned in 1862 by the architect entrusted by Pius IX with the restoration of the great gate of Pius IV, the Madonna of Porta Pia suffered the ravages of seventy-five years rain and sun and had virtually disappeared by 1938. In that year local parish priests, aided generously by the Italian civil authorities, sponsored the reproduction of the painting in mosaic, a heroic work achieved in the Vatican Studios under the direction of Prof. Biagio Biagetti.

The present brilliant shrine, tremendous in proportions and effect, sheds its luminous benediction on a city gate about which the last decades of the nineteenth century had cast many and sad shadows.

Lovers of Rome and of the sacred shrines of the Eternal City would doubtless protest against a failure to mention in these sketchy notes those Roman street shrines which are now preserved for veneration in "chapels" of their own. The first article in this series recalled some former street shrines which have been transported for more systematic cult into chapels of nearby parish or collegiate churches. But quite special is the case and the history of *le cappelle,* a cherished group apart.

Alumni of the North American College will remember with special devotion *La Madonna dell' Archetto* and *La Madonna del Divino Amore.* The *cappelle* of these devotional favorites of the

American *Romani,* as well as the chapels of *le madonne del Soccorso, del Buon Consiglio* and *del' Arco Oscuro,* all beloved of the *Romani di Roma,* deserve later and separate Holy Year notes of their own.

✠ JOHN WRIGHT
Bishop of Worcester

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for March, 1900, the leading article, by Fr. Vincent McNabb, O.P., of England, is entitled "St. Thomas Aquinas on the Hexameron." The author points out that the Angel of the Schools, deeply reverent though he was toward the literal sense of Scripture, assumed a broad and scientific attitude in the interpretation of the "six days" of creation. Fr. McNabb praises the counsel given by the Saint, that we should impose no meaning on Sacred Scripture in contradiction to established scientific facts "lest Scripture be scoffed at by unbelievers, and the way of faith be blocked to them." . . . Under the title "Vinum de Vite: the Wine of the Mass," Fr. John A. Mooney, of New York, points out that many of the commercial wines have been adulterated, rendering them unfit matter for the Holy Sacrifice. . . . Fr. Arthur Barry O'Neill, C.S.C., presents in verse "A Priest's Way of the Cross." . . . Fr. J. Putzer, C.SS.R., gives in Latin a detailed explanation of the suspension of indulgences and faculties enjoined by the Holy See for the Jubilee Year. . . . This issue also contains a letter from the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Martinelli, declaring that in the United States the faculties granted to the bishops by the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda are not suspended in the external forum, and may even be used in the internal forum in the case of "grave incommodum." . . . In the Conference section we find the formula of the profession of faith submitted by Cardinal Vaughan to the unfortunate Dr. Mivart for the retractation of his errors—a formula which the Doctor refused to sign. . . . An anonymous article on "Recent Bible Study" is concerned mainly with Protestant books and articles on the Sacred Scripture.

F.J.C.

MARY'S CO-REDEMPTION

The magnificent Mariological publication begun by Fr. Hubert du Manoir, S.J., a professor at the Catholic Institute of Paris, deserves the attention of Catholics throughout the entire world.[1] There will be three volumes in the work when it is completed. Only the first of these has thus far appeared. This one is primarily doctrinal in content. Of the various studies which enter into this first volume, we shall concentrate our attention here on the remarkable essay of Fr. Druwé, S.J., professor of Dogma in the theological faculty of the Society of Jesus at Louvain.

This essay is entitled "La médiation universelle de Marie." The reading of and meditation on this study will be a source of great profit, since the precisions which the author sets forth or suggests permit us better to understand the Blessed Virgin's role in the work for the salvation of the human race—Mary's Co-Redemption.

I

There is only one Mediator, Jesus Christ. He alone possesses the power of mediation *(la "médiatorité")* of the ontological order, which constitutes Him, the God-Man, the bond of union between God and man. But He is also mediator by reason of His activity, the redemptive activity of His earthly life, and the redemptive activity of His heavenly life, at the right hand of God, where He makes intercession for us (*Rom.* 8:34; *Heb.* 7:25; *I John* 2:1). Mary also is mediatrix between God and men, but in dependence upon Jesus, her mediative power basing itself entirely upon that of her Son.

[1] *Maria, Etudes sur la Sainte Vierge,* sous la direction d'Hubert du Manoir, S.J., (Paris: Beauchesne, 1949), Tome I. This first volume includes four books: (1) Holy Scripture and Patristic Literature; (2) Liturgy; (3) Dogma and Theology (Fr. Druwé's work is the most important in this section); (4) Spirituality and Apostolate.

The second volume will study the cult of Mary in religious orders and congregations and among the secular clergy. It will likewise show our Lady's place in literature and the arts. The third volume is the resumé of an inquiry about the cult of Mary in the different countries of the world. It will be like a reflection in Mary herself of the Church's catholicity. (References to Fr. Druwé's work will give the page numbers of his article in *Maria.*)

Christ's redemptive activity on earth had for its essential purpose the work of saving the human race, a work accomplished once and for all (ἐφάπαξ, *Heb. 7:27*), by the sacrifice of Calvary. This is the *objective* Redemption. But, in virtue of this redemption acquired by the Cross, God, until the end of time, deigns to accord to human beings who are well disposed the remission of their sins and the salutary graces. This is *subjective* Redemption.

Although there is no complete accord among theologians on the subject of this distinction,[2] we can still retain it as something which will help us to bring out a precise statement of the problem of Mary's Co-Redemption. Did the Blessed Virgin have, and does she still have, an effective part in the objective as well as in the subjective Redemption? . . . Can we call her the Co-Redemptrix (understanding this term as applying to a part taken in the objective Redemption), and "Dispensatrix of all graces"? Such is the problem proposed and discussed.

II

On the part taken by Mary in the objective Redemption, as Co-Redemptrix, it would seem essential to distinguish carefully between the "word" and the "thing."

Fr. Druwé realizes that criticisms directed against the word "Co-Redemptrix," are not without some foundation. Apart from its novelty, it can be objected to as appearing "to divide the work of the Redemption into two parts, to suggest a sameness (*univocité*) between Mary's role and that of Christ, when we should rather bring out the analogical, participated, subordinate character of Mary's co-operation." The author, nevertheless, considers the use of this word legitimate. Ancient theologians and Fathers of the Church have used equivalent expressions. Pontifical documents have consecrated this usage. The sense of this term is very precisely determined today.

Be that as it may! But one can still think that this term [Co-Redemptrix] remains in itself something subject to discussion, since it can cover an equivocation which is hard to clear up and because it opens the door to a terminology unheard of until this day: "Co-mediation, Co-merit, Co-suffering, Co-offering, Co-reconciliation, and even Concausality with respect to grace." Doubt-

[2] It has been discussed especially by G. P. Kreling, O.P., in *Theologische Opstellen*, Mélanges offerts à Mgr. Van Noort (Utrecht, 1944), pp. 118-30.

less by these somewhat forced expressions Christian piety wishes to insist upon the intimate union between the new Eve and the new Adam. But is there not some ground for fear that the Catholic apologetic will thus lose some of its force, by reason of the confusions that such expressions engender in some minds less enlightened or even merely prejudiced? We think particularly of our separated brethren, the Protestants.

The word, however, has only a secondary importance. The thing that matters is the doctrine.

III

Fr. Druwé analyzes at great length and in minute detail the pontifical documents which treat of Mary's mediation. The encyclical *Ad diem illum* by Pius X is given particular attention. "The consequence of this community of sentiments and of sufferings between Jesus and Mary," the Pope declares, "is that Mary has most worthily merited being made the *reparatrix* of fallen humanity and therefore (*atque ideo*), the dispenser of all the treasures which Jesus has acquired for us by His death and His blood."[3] Fr. Druwé concludes:

> It is apparent here that the Pope distinguishes a twofold stage in Mary's collaboration with Christ. The first, which is presented as the basis of the other *(atque ideo)*, is nothing else than the participation in the very redemption of the human race, that is in the objective Redemption, in which Christ, and Mary with Him, acquires the treasures of which she becomes later, with Him, the dispenser for the subjective Redemption.

Then, taking up another affirmation of the encyclical,[4] the author continues:

[3] "Ex hac autem Mariam inter et Christum communione dolorum ac voluntatis, promeruit illa ut reparatrix perditi orbis dignissime fieret, *atque ideo* universorum munerum dispensatrix quae nobis Jesus nece et sanguine comparavit."

[4] "De congruo, ut aiunt, *promeret* nobis quae Christus de condigno *promeruit*," Pope Pius X says in the encyclical. The present tense, used with reference to Mary's merit, ought not to be interpreted as a simple actual presentation of merits to obtain for us the application of the past merits of Jesus Christ. The entire context suggests Mary's co-operation at the very moment when Jesus merited the Redemption for us.

> One must recognize in the activity which Mary expends beside her Redeemer Son, not, doubtless, a merit in the strict sense *(de condigno)*, which gives a right, properly so-called to graces, [merit] which is . . . the exclusive prerogative of Christ, but merit so-called by way of analogy, designated by theologians as *de congruo,* that is, of fitness (pp. 442 f.).

The theologians discuss the exact meaning of the pontifical texts in such detail as to lose sight of the basic question. A Louvain professor has very well stated the problem upon which the theologians seem to be divided.

> The question is not to learn whether Mary was intimately united to Christ by a moral union in those acts by which He immediately brought about the objective Redemption, particularly His Passion and death. Nor is the question whether or not the Virgin has made satisfaction or has merited for men. The only question is to ascertain whether or not the Com-Passion of God's Mother, her satisfactory and meritorious acts, have contributed *directly,* to some extent, to produce those effects which we designate by the expression "objective Redemption."[5]

Fr. Druwé believes that Tradition answers this last question in the affirmative. In a thousand different ways, he tells us, it insists that "by her consent and by her active participation in the redemptive sacrifice, the Virgin has obtained—through Christ, and with Him and in Him—the overthrow of the old Serpent, the restoration of the world, the reconciliation with God of the entire human race" (p. 525). This is the basic argument brought forward by all those who favor an objective Co-Redemption. Everyone, however, admits this argument and its conclusion. The problem, as Fr. Goossens has very well explained, lies elsewhere. The problem is to know whether Mary's consent to the Incarnation, whether her active participation in the redemptive sacrifice, have obtained *in an immediate and direct manner,* the effects included in the objective Redemption. Does not the above-mentioned process of reasoning avoid this precise aspect of the question a little too easily?

IV

Nevertheless, Fr. Druwé has an indisputable advantage over his predecessors. He sets out to give a more satisfactory explanation

[5] Werner Goossens, *De cooperatione immediata Matris Redemptoris ad Redemptionem objectivam,* translated by Fr. Druwé (Paris, 1939), p. 16.

of a thesis which has, up until now, been affirmed rather than demonstrated.

Although it was not absolutely unheard of before, this explanation should receive attention. It starts from a principle enunciated by St. Thomas himself, the principle that it is more glorious for man to expiate sin fully by way of satisfaction than simply to see himself pardoned, for thus, in a way, he becomes the cause of his own recovery.[6] That is why Jesus, whose function it is to be both priest and victim in the redemptive sacrifice, was taken from the womb of humanity. But it was also necessary that humanity should in a certain way accept this Priest-Mediator, charged with the task of representing it. It was requisite that humanity should give Him its flesh and its blood as its own offering. "The Annunciation," St. Thomas tells us again, "demanded the Virgin's consent *in the name of all human nature.*"[7]

For His own part, the Redeemer entered into the world with the sentiments described in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "Wherefore when he cometh into the world he saith: Sacrifice and oblation thou wouldst not: but a body thou hast fitted to me . . . behold I come . . . that I should do thy will, O God . . . in which will we are sanctified by the body of Jesus Christ once" (*Heb.* 10:5-7, 10).

By the *fiat* of the Annunciation, Mary has entered fully into this sacrificial disposition of the Saviour. The last act performed by the sorrowful Virgin at the foot of the Cross is virtually contained in her consent to the Incarnation. And so our author concludes: "Once we admit that Mary's consent to the Annunciation constitutes, in the sense we have just explained, a real co-operation towards the objective redemption, it is inconsistent to refuse to recognize this same co-operation in her assistance at the bloody sacrifice of her Son" (p. 529).

Thus there is a twofold aspect to the Virgin Mary's role on Calvary. First, Mary has concurred with Christ "to pay to God

[6] Magis homini gloriosum est quod vitam aeternam ex meritis habeat quam si sine meritis ad eam perveniret. . . . Satisfactio facit ut satisfaciens sit quodammodo causa suae purgationis" (St. Thomas, *III Sent.*, dist. 20, a. 1, sol. 2).

[7] St. Thomas, *Sum. theol.*, III, q. 30, a. 1. St. Thomas explains aspects of the fitness of the Annunciation: "Quarto, ut ostenderetur esse quoddam spirituale matrimonium inter Filium Dei et humanam naturam. *Et ideo per Annuntiationem expectabatur consensus Virginis loco totius humanae naturae.*"

the sole price of our deliverance, to offer to Him the unique sacrifice of our reconciliation" (p. 531). Benedict XV declares that, as Mother, "to procure the salvation of men she abdicated her maternal rights over her Son and she sacrificed Him, in so far as it lay within her power, to placate justice, so that it can rightly be said that she herself has redeemed the human race with Christ."[8] This first aspect of Mary's role, however, only takes on its complete significance when it is introduced into the very idea of the redemptive sacrifice. Scheeben has "very well stressed this characteristic of sacrifice, that it is an action in which we normally find, engaged with the priest who sanctifies the oblation, the person or the community in whose favor the sacrifice is offered" (p. 552). In this participation of the human race in the redemptive sacrifice, Mary acted in our place.

We have already said that, on the day of the Annunciation, Mary consented that the salutary victim should be taken from her flesh. So it is that

> . . . the virtual influence of that consent which, far from withdrawing, she confirmed ever more fully in the measure in which she realized better what it involved in the way, doubtless, of sufferings for herself, but above all, of glory for God and of salutary effects for men . . . the persisting power of that consent, I say, sufficed to make the Mother, standing at the foot of the Cross, the co-offerer of the sacrifice of the redemption, in the same way, but much more perfectly, that the faithful who assist devoutly at the Eucharistic sacrifice, are offerers of this along with the priest (p. 533).

Again, it was necessary that, in Mary, humanity should in a certain way make the sacrifice of Calvary its own.

> He who has created us with no help from us did not wish that we should be saved without putting something of our own into the process. He has willed that the redemptive work for which He gave His Son should be accomplished only as something dependent upon the gift of that same Son freely made by the Mother whom He had chosen from among men. Thus taking the place of humanity, Mary, far more than Abraham did with respect to Isaac, gave up for us in Jesus, the dearest

---

[8] Ita cum Filio patiente et moriente passa est et paene commortua, *sic materna in Filium jura pro hominum salute abdicavit* placandaeque justitiae, quantum ad se pertinebat, *Filium immolavit, ut dici merito queat Ipsam cum Christo humanum genus redemisse" (Inter sodalicia).*

thing she had in the world, the one she loved infinitely more than herself. The bonds of blood and heart which united her to her Son were amply sufficient to make her act of giving Him up to what God had planned for Him enlist her in the most intimate fashion in the sacrifice of reconciliation for men (p. 534).

Every theologian worthy of the name will subscribe quickly to such considerations, founded on Tradition and on logic. All of them, moreover, will make their own the conclusion by which Scheeben seems to anticipate Benedict XV: "By reason of this, Mary's intimate sharing in the redemptive sacrifice, we can say that, with Christ, she has made satisfaction to God for sin, has merited grace, and has redeemed the world. All of this, let it be well understood, is in and through Christ's sacrifice, in so far as she was the co-offerer in this." [9]

It is enough to read Fr. Druwé's conclusion to see the nuances, or, rather, let us say the differences, by which this conclusion is distinguished from Scheeben's affirmation.

> The merit and the satisfactory value of this offering made by the Mother in the name of humanity which thus entered into the sacrifice of objective Redemption, *became identified so to speak (se confondaient pour ainsi dire)* with the adequate satisfaction and merit of the High Priest. To be more exact, through the impetrative value of the sacrifice, they attained the same object: the objective Redemption (p. 534).

The thought here can be expressed only with some difficulty. His anxiety to bring Mary's co-operation up to the very level of objective Redemption causes the writer to introduce a certain confusion between the merit and satisfaction of the sole Redeemer and the satisfaction and the merit of the Virgin Co-Redeemer. They become, as it were, identified. Let us clear up this confusion by recalling, once again, the exact point of the problem.

The problem is not to know whether Mary has been intimately united to Christ in the acts which have brought about the objective Redemption. Nor is it, again, to learn whether the Virgin has merited and satisfied for men, and thus contributed to their redemption. Every one admits and should admit this much. The point is, however, to know very exactly if Mary's satisfactory and meritorious works terminated *immediately and directly* in the effects

[9] Scheeben, *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik*, III, 1801.

designated by the expression "objective Redemption." Christ's acts are ordered immediately and directly to these effects. But it is *in and through Christ's* sacrifice that Mary attains them.

All theologians agree in admitting in Mary a real participation in the objective Redemption. The only possible controversy is concerned with *the immediate and direct character* of this participation. In giving us a timely reminder that Mary, by her consent to the Incarnation and by the offering of the divine Victim she made on Calvary, was the representative of all humanity, Fr. Druwé has well stressed the best argument in favor of her participation in the objective Redemption. Redeemed before the rest through her Immaculate Conception, the Virgin Mother was able to fulfill the function of the representative of humanity entering into Christ's expiation. But her intervention has effect and value only through Jesus and in Him. Admitting fully a co-operation in the objective Redemption, we must be cautious at this point before we speak of immediate and direct co-operation.

Moreover, this function of Mary's as humanity's representative was not, in itself, absolutely indispensible. Certainly it entered into the prevision of divine Providence which, at the side of the new Adam, foresaw and prepared the new Eve. Already, however, by the very fact of the Incarnation, the New Adam carried within Himself very truly all humanity, whose Head He was. To bring about the redemption of all, it was necessary that He should be the representative of all, substituting Himself in the place of all, and in intimate contact with all, thus bringing all humanity into the very action which reconciled it with God. This is the great principle of solidarity stressed by St. Paul.[10] Christ's death was morally the death of the human race, whose representative He was. All tradition seized upon that fruitful idea to affirm that "the human race is contained in Christ as in its Head and its juridical representative, in such a way that Christ's actions are morally those of the human family." [11] Christ's merit thus becomes our merit, and His sacrifice, our sacrifice.

[10] Cf. *II Cor.* 5:14, 15, 21; *Gal.* 3:13. See the development of St. Paul's thought in Prat's *La théologie de S. Paul* (Paris, 1912), II, 290-99.

[11] Prat, *op. cit.*, p. 315. The same idea is expressed by Scheeben in *The Mysteries of Christianity.*

Not for a moment can there be any question of admitting that Mary alone, either at the moment of the Incarnation or on Calvary, could have been the representative of humanity which was to be redeemed. This function as representative belongs *primarily and essentially* to the new Adam, the Head of humanity. Mary has obtained it *only in a subsidiary manner,* in her capacity as the spiritual mother of men, as one redeemed before her children. Necessary and indispensible as it was in Jesus, this quality of representative is, in Mary, consonant with *the very high degree of congruity* which takes in the "recapitulation" of the work of Adam and Eve in that of Christ and His Mother. Anyone can see that Mary's work thus obtains its value and attains its purpose only if Christ's work be accorded at least a priority of reason. It is well here to recall the distinction long ago formulated by Billot, between the Redemption considered merely by itself and the Redemption "realised more perfectly."

> The Redemption, considered in itself, is the payment of a proportionate satisfaction for the sins of men . . . and this price Christ alone, to the exclusion of any other person whatsoever, gave in offering Himself on the Cross. The Redemption "realized more perfectly" is that accidental perfection added to the work of Christ so that men may be more aptly recalled to the end of eternal life. It is for this perfection that God has placed a mother and mediatrix between Christ, the King of Glory and the redeemed, a mother and mediatrix in whom nothing austere or terrible is to be found, but who appears, on the contrary, filled with kindness and mercy. As a result her intervention in the distribution of the merits of the Cross brings a particular sweetness to the work of our Redemption. And I say that this perfection in the Redemption is the fruit of the sorrows of the Virgin and of her compassion with the sufferings of her Son.[12]

* * * *

Doubtless this is only one aspect of the question. But, in accepting fully Mary's co-operation in the objective Redemption, the distinction between *ad esse simpliciter* and *ad melius esse Redemptionis,* suggested by Billot, may be very useful in solving the problem taken up again by Fr. Druwé. Theologians who favor Mary's *direct and immediate* participation in the objective Redemption (*ad esse simpliciter Redemptionis*), will always be somewhat em-

[12] Billot, *De Verbo Incarnato* (Rome, 1912), p. 400.

barrassed in making "redemption" and "co-redemption" agree. Those who favor a *moral and mediate* participation, can, it would seem, taking cognizance of the pontifical teachings, of Tradition and of Scripture, more easily conciliate the functions of Jesus and of Mary, the Passion and the Com-Passion, the Redemption and the Co-Redemption, in the sense in which this latter term is acceptable.

Basically, perhaps, only a dispute about words separates the first group from the second. Fr. Druwé's fine study, in which he treats most frequently co-operation in the objective Redemption without specifying whether this is immediate and direct co-operation, seems to confirm this view quite well.

A. Michel
Professor Emeritus of Theology in the University of Lille

Christ's Love for the Church

From the first moment of His Incarnation, when He laid the first foundations of the Church, down to His last mortal breath, our Redeemer never ceased for an instant, though He was the Son of God, to labor unto weariness for the establishing and strengthening of the Church, whether in giving us the bright example of His holiness, or preaching, or conversing, or gathering and instructing disciples. And so We desire that all, who claim the Church as their mother, should seriously consider that not only the sacred ministers and those who have consecrated themselves to God in religious life, but the other members as well of the mystical Body of Jesus Christ have the obligation of working hard and constantly for the upbuilding and the increase of this Body. We wish this to be remembered especially by members of Catholic Action who assist the bishops and priests in their apostolic labors—and to their praise be it said that they do remember—and also by those associates of pious unions who contribute their work to the same end.

—Pope Pius XII in his encyclical *Mystici Corporis*.

THE LORD'S PRAYER. WHAT IS IT?

To the present writer, one of the greatest anomalies in our preaching and catechising is the way we conceive of and explain the Lord's Prayer. We slight its sublime beauty and fail to catch its loveliness and warmth. It is the divine formula given to us by Our Lord to express our response to His commandment of love, of love of God and love of our neighbor. It is the symphony of the whole life of Christ put to words, a life of love of His Heavenly Father and of man. It should likewise be the symphony of our whole life in the terms of love's strivings, furtherance of the interests of God upon earth and the welfare and happiness of our fellow-man.

The Our Father is primarily an act of love of God. That the Our Father is an act of love is, indeed, recognized at times, but only too seldom. In some moral theologies the recitation of the Our Father is mentioned as one of the ways of meeting the obligation of eliciting an act of charity. But it is so mentioned only in passing, and the impression is given that that fact is merely incidental to the Lord's Prayer.

Almost without fail, the salutation, "Our Father," is explained and commented upon as a reminder that God, being our Father, is most willing to hear our prayer and grant our petition. Whereas, in truth, the address, "Our Father," should be an outpouring of our filial affection which we then proceed to particularize.

It is the characteristic of love of benevolence to be concerned with the interests of the loved one. A lover cannot be happy unless the loved one prosper. Unless the first half of the Our Father is an expression of our concern with and for the interests of God upon earth, they are hollow and empty. What do the words "hallowed be Thy name" (may Thy name be hallowed) directly signify? Nothing if not a desire and a wish whispered to God that His name be praised by all men and that He be glorified upon earth. In other words, they give voice to our love of benevolence towards God. "Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." If these are not to be but empty words, they must be freighted with a yearning of our heart that the rule of God, our loving Father, may soon unite all men among themselves and with God in the oneness of mind and affection which finds its perfection in

heaven. As such they are a most beautiful, explicit, and unmistakable expression of love for God.

When we make the first part of the Our Father an expression of love, our spoken desire that the interests of God be furthered upon earth will also include an implicit pledge that, with the help of God's grace, we will do all in our power to make that desire come true in our own lives. And this desire and pledge add up to a plea for grace to enable us to fulfil our pledge and thus contribute to the honor and glory of God. Thus the first part of the Our Father becomes also a most efficacious prayer of petition.

The second part of the Our Father is also a most beautiful act of love of our neighbor if we are mindful that Our Lord has taught us to pray for "*our* daily bread," for forgiveness of "*our* trespasses" and that God "deliver *us* from evil" and so wing our prayer to heaven, an expression of our love and solicitude for our neighbor.

That the Our Father is primarily an act of love and at the same time a most beautiful act of love of our neighbor, is not a forced but a most natural understanding of the Lord's Prayer. This should be evident on the face of it. How the real nature of the Our Father has come to be so overlooked or so little stressed is hard to understand. It could not have been always thus. I remember, while browsing through an old tome, coming across an ingenuous argument in connection with the dispute regarding the frequency with which one is obliged to elicit an act of charity. It went like this. The Our Father should be said every day. Atqui, the Our Father is an act of charity. Therefore, an act of charity should be elicited every day. The major was proved by an appeal to the fact that in the Our Father we are taught to pray only for our *daily* bread. Therefore, it should be a daily prayer. The minor was taken for granted as evident. Whatever may be said of the cogency of this argument, it certainly indicates that there was a time when the real beauty and sublimity of the Our Father was better appreciated than it is today. Believe it or not, it is not so long ago that a professor of dogmatic theology, after attending a conference in which the Our Father was expounded as an act of charity of God and our neighbor, was heard to confess that he had never before heard of or adverted to the Our Father in that light!

What a difference it makes when one conceives of and recites the Our Father as a divinely taught act of love, is well expressed

by a nun grown old in the service of God. She happened to hear the Lord's Prayer explained as an act of charity. "The Our Father," said she some weeks afterward, "has become so much more precious to me. It is so warm and inspiring. It seems to lift me up to God and put me in His very arms. Would that I had been taught that in the early days of my religious life!"

MARTIN E. GOUNLEY, C.SS.R.

Ilchester, Maryland

TEACHING IN THE CHURCH

Most of their [the Fathers'] works have no other object than to preserve in its purity, to exhibit in all its fullness and beauty, to defend against all attacks the truth, the whole divine truth, as revealed by God to man.

The Church herself has ever felt that this was the primary object of her mission. At every period of her history we find her still more solicitous to preserve the faith in its purity than to propagate it among men. In the course of ages she may have passed through phases of darkness, intellectual and moral; her champions may have at times lacked earnestness and vigor in their fight against evil; but never do we detect in her the slightest trace of indifference or neglect when the purity or integrity of her faith is assailed. The discordant note of doctrinal error is the one thing to arouse her from momentary torpor, and to intensify all her energies. Like the enemy's trumpet or battle cry to the sleeping warrior, it brings her at once to her feet, makes her summon hastily her forces, nor will she know peace until the foe has been irrecoverably defeated and crushed.

—Fr. Hogan, S.S., in "Dogmatic Theology," the twelfth article of his *Clerical Studies*, published in *AER*, VII, 4 (April, 1893), 272 f.

THE NEW HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS

PART III

THE JEWISH COLLECTION

This collection is known through Dr. Sukenik's publication mentioned repeatedly in the rest of this article—*Megillot genuzot*—: this is our primary source of information. This work has been reviewed in a number of articles, some of them very valuable, as they call our attention to some problems met with in the new texts or propose explanations of the difficulties presented by those documents. From the nature of the case, as pointed out by the different writers, no solution can claim finality while we have only a part of the texts at our disposal. In our survey of the Jewish Collection, we follow Dr. Sukenik's presentation.

(A) *The War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness* (Sukenik pp. 18-26).[1] In its present state, this leather scroll is 2 meters 90 long and about 16 centim. high (1 meter=39.37 in.; 1 centimeter=0.3437 inch). It had a strip of parchment about 40 centim. long which held it closed. The written portion of the scroll consists of 19 columns on three sheets and some fragments. The lower edge of the scroll has suffered: it is worn and eaten away so that several lines—about 3 or 4—have disappeared at the bottom. The sheets now average 16 to 18 lines. The text has suffered also in places from the substance (pitch or wax) used on the outside of the scroll, as the substance has seeped through and corroded the leather. Plates VI and VIII give a good idea of the appearance of the scroll rolled up and of the damage it has suffered. The sheets are lined horizontally to guide the writing (the letters hang from the lines, as noted before, in such a case) and vertically to mark the beginning of the columns, that is to say, the right hand side for a Hebrew text. For this, see especially Plates VII and IX. The writing is very regular and clear, and may be studied very conveniently on the large Plates just referred to.

[1] Parenthetical references throughout this article refer to the bibliography printed as footnote 1 in the first installment—*AER*, CXXII, 1 (Jan. 1950), 25-36.

The original title and the name of the author—possibly mentioned in the lost part of the work—are unknown.[2] The title under which the work is referred to above was given to the scroll by Dr. Sukenik on the basis of the beginning of the first column which calls the opponents in the struggle described in the book "Sons of Light" and "Sons of Darkness." [3]

According to Sukenik's analysis, the "Sons of Light" are "the sons of Levi, the sons of Judah and the sons of Benjamin." The "sons of Darkness" are Edom, Moab, Ammon, Philistia, the Kittiyim of Assur and of Egypt. The "sons of Light" who have returned from "the Desert of the Nations to encamp in the Desert of Jerusalem" engage in battle and at first they succeed in "smiting wickedness." Then "the host of Belial gird themselves," and "the great hand of God shall humble" them. The struggle spreads to all the nations (Suk. p. 19). In this great struggle there is a mention of "the Kings of the North" (Suk. p. 22). In this connection we read, here again translating literally: "This is the time of salvation for the people of God and the period [Hebrew: qēṣ] of the dominion for all the men of his party [lit: lot] and the lasting destruction of all the party [lit: lot] of Belial." [4] We have

[2] Sukenik suggests that those items may have been in the conclusion of the work on the analogy of the *Hebrew* text of Ecclus. where the colophon gives the name of the author and the title of the book.

[3] The contrast between "light" and "darkness" is familiar from the New Testament. We find the phrase "sons of light" in Luke 16:8; John 12:36; Ephes. 5:8; I Thess. 5:5—beside such phrases as: to be the light, to have the light, to be in the light, used of the faithful disciples (cf. v.g. *Matt.* 5:14-16; *John* 8:12; 12:35,36). We do not find the phrase "sons of darkness," but we hear of being in darkness, of being darkness, of not belonging to the night or darkness, of the power of darkness (cf. *I John* 2:9,11; *I Thess.* 5:4; *Ephes.* 5:8; *I Thess.* 5:5; *Luke* 22:53). The Old Testament also uses "light" and "darkness" in a figurative meaning, but not the phrase "sons of light" or "of darkness." The use of the expression in this work is thus something new and interesting.

[4] Sukenik (p. 22) examines in connection with this passage the meaning of the word *qēṣ* explained currently in our Dictionaries as meaning "end." He argues, rightly, that the meaning must be rather: time, period, etc. as had been maintained by several before apropos of the Damascus document and of Ecclus 36:13 where *qēṣ* is paralleled by a word meaning time and 43,6[b] where the parallel line 6[a] has also a word denoting time. Cf. also the Greek rendering these. For "time" "period" etc. cf. Charles: *Apoc. and Pseudep.*, II, 787 and 800, and the authors mentioned there. This meaning should be taken into account for passages of the Old Testament.

(Suk. p. 19) a summary of the document's detailed description of the army of the Sons of Light: the different classes of soldiers, infantry and cavalry, officers of different ranks, supply service, etc.; the age limits of the several categories of troops; the "signs" or standards of the various groups with their special mottoes or inscriptions, thus, for instance, on the great flag there is written: the people of God, and the names of Israel and Aaron, and the names of the Twelve Tribes of Israel. For the various circumstances of the battle, standards bear special inscriptions. Thus, when they return from battle, the flag has this inscription: Song of praise of God, Greatness of God, Praise of God, Glory of God. Fr. Tournay (D, b: p. 213) very aptly recalls the watchwords mentioned in II Mac. 8:23 and 13:15. Blasts of trumpets of several kinds, by priests and levites, accompany the different stages of the battle; there are special trumpets with their own inscriptions for each stage. We have also a full account of the weapons. Before the battle or in the intervals between attacks, the High Priest, "in the midst of his brethren the priests, the levites, and the overseers of the camps," addresses the army to encourage them to fight: "fear not and be not dismayed before them and do not yield [lit: come back]." The foes are described as "a congregation of wickedness, and in darkness are all their works and to it [the darkness] is their desire" (cf. *Eph.* 5-11-13; *I John* 2:9, 11). He prays also for divine assistance to his people:

"Rise Mighty One
Take thy captives, o glorious one [lit: man of glory],
and take thy spoil, o Doer of great deeds!
Put thy hand on the neck of thy foes
And *thy foot* on the mounds of wounded![5]
Smite the nations thy adversaries,
Let thy sword devour the guilty flesh!"

[5] The rendering "foot" supposes a correction of the text which reads "standard." For this correction, we are indebted to Dr. Sukenik. Ap. Fr. Tournay (D, b: p. 213, n. 2). The parallelism supports the correction. The Hebrew letters D and R are very much alike in these MSS as also in the usual square alphabet. It may be recalled that C. C. Torrey (*Documents of the Primitive Church*, 1941, pp. 221 f.) supposes a similar confusion in Apoc. 19:16. The current text has: "on his *thigh*" for which Torrey postulates an Aramaic original meaning properly: "on his *foot*," but the real text should be rather: "on his *banner*." This is mentioned here merely as an illustration. The passage of the Apocalypse is difficult.

Then come some verses calling on Sion and all the cities of Judah to rejoice and exult. The text then continues:

"Open thy gates always
to bring in to thee the wealth of the nations
and let their kings serve thee,
and let them do obeisance to thee, all that humbled thee
[or: that were humbled by thee],
and let them lick the dust of thy feet!"

After a few verses omitted here, we are told that after the victory the army gathers to sing God's praise:

"they shall answer and say:[6]
Blessed be the God of Israel
Who is faithful to his covenant [lit: keeps faith]
and to the promises of victory to the people redeemed by
him [lit: of his redemption].
We are the people of thy holiness [thy holy people],
for thy deeds of fidelity we will praise thy name,
and for thy mighty deeds we exalt [thee].
Be exalted, be exalted, God of Gods,
and be lifted up in thy might!"

It is hardly necessary to call the reader's attention to the strongly biblical language of our text. The author clearly is thoroughly familiar with Scripture, and expresses his thoughts in its words without effort.

Many other particulars are to be found on Plates VIII and IX, but, giving a translation of these texts would lengthen this article unduly. Enough is given here, we think, to enable the reader to form an idea of the character of this document. Even though in the parts known so far, the usual Apocalyptic machinery is absent—no visions, no angels to explain visions or to reveal secrets to the seer—there is about this composition, as far as may be judged now, an unmistakable apocalyptic air to justify our regarding it as an apocalypse, at least provisionally.

In the concluding part of his account of the "War," Dr. Sukenik (pp. 21-24) examines the question of the relations of the new

[6] We find this type of expression very frequently in the Gospels. Matt. Mark and Luke, regularly say: answer*ing*-said. John commonly has: answer*ed and* said, thus a more literally Hebrew type. Popular Arabic also knows this form. Cf. Dalman: *die Worte Jesu*, I (1898), 19 f.

document and the Damascus document or Zadokite work as some prefer to call it.[7] The date of the Damascus document is disputed and this naturally complicates matters. Some authors attribute it to the time of the Seleucids (305 ff. B.C.); others to the eleventh century A.D.; and various dates between these two extremes have been defended by others. So also the religious circle to which the work is supposed to be due is identified very differently by scholars. Since there is no agreement on those fundamental problems, we may not start from the Damascus document to find the answers to the questions raised by the "War." We will rather look to the "War" for help in solving the enigma of the Damascus document. For it is a fact that there is a relationship between the "War" and the "Hymns" to which we will turn our attention immediately in the Jewish Collection and the Sectarian document and the Commentary on Habaccuc in the Syrian Collection on the one hand and the Damascus document on the other. This relationship appears in several phrases and expressions which are found in all these texts, in the general character of the Hebrew, in the religious ideas and terminology. From all this we may conclude that all these documents come from one same group or from very closely related groups. Therefore, the identification of the group or "sect" to which the library of the cave belonged will help to identify the circle to which we owe the Damascus document. If the Damascus document were to be dated certainly some time after the beginning of the Christian era, it could represent the views of an offshoot from the original group whose library was preserved in the cave.

(B) *The Hymns.* This part of the collection is described by Dr. Sukenik (pp. 27-33). A brief introduction (pp. 27-28) gives an account of the state of the scroll. Then comes the transcription of some of the Hymns with notes and several plates, very clear and legible together with the transcription of most of the texts reproduced on the plates. The photographs show very distinctly the horizontal and the vertical lines made to guide the scribe.

[7] On the Damascus document discovered (1910) by S. Schechter in the Cairo Genizah, see: Schechter. *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, I, *Fragments of a Zadogite Work* (Cambridge, 1910); Charles: *Apoc. and Pseudep.* (London, 1913), II, 785-834; Frey: in *D. B. Supplem.* s. v. "Apocryphes" (1926), 396-403; P. E. Kahle: *The Cairo Geniza* (1947), pp. 11-12; Tournay (D, b.), p. 216, n. 3.

Plate X is reproduced on a very small scale in A, c: p. 15 and, better, enlarged D, d: p. 308. In our description of the document we follow Dr. Sukenik's account.

The document consists of three sheets with 12 columns of writing, 4 to each sheet. The sheets when found did not form one single scroll; they were folded and inserted the one within the other. The manuscript has suffered very much: Plate XI reproducing one of the sheets shows the damage very clearly. Some parts are eaten away completely or covered with a coat of wax or pitch making the text illegible. However Professor Biberkraut's efforts succeeded in remedying some of the evil so that it became possible for Dr. Sukenik to complete the text of several lines. The columns are longer than those of the "War" scroll, up to 32½ centim. high. The number of lines is double that of the other document. The upper and lower edges having disappeared, it is not possible to be certain of the original number of lines. Some of the columns have now 39 lines. The copyist was a skilled scribe, though somewhat inferior to that of the "War" scroll. Some peculiarities of the script of the text reproduced by the copyist led him into occasional mistakes (cf. Sukenik, p. 28). Here again, when we have the full text, similar mistakes of the copyist may suggest some possibilities in Biblical textual criticism.

The three sheets belonged to a scroll containing Hymns which resemble the canonical psalms. They are full of echoes from different parts of the Bible, showing complete familiarity with the Scriptures, so that the thoughts find their natural expression in biblical phrases. Yet those poetic compositions have their originality. The study of their practical structure may help to understand also better something of the poetry of the Bible. It may be noted that that poetry is not written in verse lines in the manuscript. These texts have already attracted the attention of several scholars who have published translations of the one or the other of the Hymns, some of them with elaborate notes (see especially A, c: pp. 36-46; D, b, c, d). On comparing some of the translations, it will be seen that at times they differ considerably, particularly when the text is incomplete so that there is no context to help (see for instance Fr. Tournay's translation and that of Fr. Bauchet for the text of Plate X: D, b: pp. 223 f. and D, c.). Some of the differences are due also to resemblances between several of the

letters—v.g. Waw and Yod, Daleth and Resh, etc.—so that the same words are read differently by the translators. We must naturally await the publication of the texts in full so as to have more material for comparison and therefore for a better intelligence of the contents.

(C) Dr. Sukenik reproduces on Plate I—size of the original text—a fragment not otherwise identified. Here also the lines, horizontal and vertical, are very distinct. The letters are quite clear, but neither of the two columns is complete so that we cannot get a full sentence anywhere. Some phrases appear in the Hymns, so that this fragment may be regarded as belonging to the same group of documents.

(D) Plate II gives a reduced reproduction of two scrolls which have not yet been unrolled. From their appearance it is clear that their text must be damaged considerably.

(E) The last part of the book (pp. 34-43), after a brief introduction, reproduces the text of Isaias, Chap. 42-43: the Masoretic text, fully vowelled, with the text of the Isaias Scroll opposite so that one can easily compare both texts. At first it had been thought that two copies of Isaias had been found. Dr. Sukenik explains that he had the Syrian's manuscript for some days—two days, according to Mar A. Y. Samuel, rather against the wishes of the Archbishop, who states that Dr. Sukenik published his copy without consulting him (A, c: p. 31).

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DISCOVERY

Some of the topics that might be treated under this heading could not be examined in this article. It would be necessary to use Hebrew words and quotations. It seems better therefore to reserve this discussion for another article. But from what has been said in the preceding pages, it can readily be understood how the discovery could be hailed as phenomenal and as a fact of extraordinary importance. We may summarize here some of the facts which justify this view of the discovery.

The genuineness of the discovery is placed above all doubt by the examination of the cave by Fr. de Vaux and Mr. Harding. The archaeological evidence points to the pre-Christian period, at least on a natural interpretation of the facts. It supports the conclusions reached independently on palaeographic grounds. Thus then we have now texts of the Hebrew Bible which take us at

least a thousand years before the date of the oldest biblical book in Hebrew known before: Isaias; parts of Daniel; Habacuc; fragments of Genesis, Leviticus, Deuteronomy and Judges. Before this discovery there was only the Nash Papyrus, which was not part of a biblical book, but a fragment from some other composition, important because it contained a pre-Masoretic text of the Ten Commandments and the beginning of the Shema: "Hear, O Israel: the Lord is our God, the Lord is one. And thou shalt love thy God with all thy heart." [8] The Nash Papyrus was dated commonly second century A.D., but Dr. Albright has argued in favor of a much earlier date B.C., and his view, though not admitted universally, has led many critics to reconsider the question and to admit a date some time B.C. Thus it becomes possible, by comparing the new manuscripts with the Nash Papyrus and among themselves, to classify the different scripts and to infer their probable sequence and their dates. [9] We have then in these manuscripts *direct evidence* of the state of the Hebrew text of the Bible before the Christian era. The significant conclusion so far is the vindication of the essential correctness of the Masoretic text: the Masoretic text has its roots in an ancient tradition. Further, the palaeographic material supplies us with means of removing mistakes existing in our traditional Hebrew text: hence a great help in the problems of O.T. textual criticism.

The discovery also authorizes hopes of other discoveries of texts—biblical and non-biblical—in Palestine where such a thing had been regarded as altogether improbable. At the same time

[8] *Deut.* 6:4-9. The text of the fragment ends with the first part of v. 5. On the Shema, so important in Jewish religious life, may be seen v.g. *The Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, revised ed. by Dr. Joseph H. Hertz, late Chief Rabbi of the British Empire (N. Y., 1948), pp. 108, 116 f.-263, 269. On the Nash Papyrus, see Reff, ap. Goettsberger, *op. cit.*, p. 422; R. Pfeiffer: *Introd. O. T.*, pp. 72 f. and p. 184; espec. Albright: J. B. L., 1937, pp. 145-176; Sukenik, p. 13-14 (with an excellent reproduction of Plate III).

[9] Cf. B, c: pp. 20-21: a table of the square Aramaic-Hebrew forms of script from 200 B. C. to 200 A. D. This does not include the Scripts of the Jewish Collection nor those of the fragments discovered by Fr. de Vaux and Mr. Harding. However, incomplete as it is, the chart allows us to follow the evolution. This table is part of a palaeographic study of the MSS by Trever (*ibid.*, pp. 6 ff.). See also (*ibid.*, pp. 33 ff.) Birnbaum's note on the "date of the Isaiah Scroll." He dates it in the first half of the second century B. C.

however, it should put us on our guard against fake discoveries, though it is hardly probable that a forgery could be sucessful for any real length of time and deceive everybody.

The considerable non-biblical material brought to light by this discovery is a significant revelation of Jewish religious life in the last century (approximately) before the Christian era. It is too early yet to appraise our documents from this point of view, as has been remarked before in this article. We do not possess the texts in full, and as they open up something of a new world, there will be many questions which it will take time to answer. But these texts will help us to understand better the Jewish mind in Palestine, the religious parties which were bound to affect also the political life of the nation. Needless to say that all this will help us to understand something of the background of Christ's ministry.

Finally the discovery throws light on the Hebrew language. The surprising fact is the extensive use of Hebrew in the documents known so far when greater use of Aramaic could have been expected. Though there is an Aramaic document in the Syrian Collection, and possibly also in the Jewish Collection which has two unrolled texts, the fact is that Hebrew is abundantly represented in the new documents. Thus we have another proof of the continued use of Hebrew as a literary language, not necessarily in daily life. This Hebrew is closely related to the language of the Bible. It is really the continuation of Biblical Hebrew, more classical even than for instance the Hebrew of Ecclesiastes. As we said above, the authors of the documents are thoroughly acquainted with the Hebrew Bible. But the language also represents a transition to the Hebrew of the Mishnah.[10] The new texts supply us with a number of new words and phrases, or with earlier evidence for words which were known only from later documents; with new meanings of known words; with new grammatical forms. Some of the spellings, if other facts confirm the limited evidence available at present, might suggest something regarding the pronunciation.

From this survey of the library of the cave, it may be seen

[10] For a treatment of the relations of Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew, the reader may consult M. H. Segal: *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford, 1927), pp. 1-20. For the vocalization of the early Babylonian MSS, cf. E. Porath: *Mishnaic Hebrew* (Jerus., 1938) (in Hebrew).

that we have here a treasure upon which students will be able to draw for a long time, bringing forth things old and new.

POST SCRIPT (OCTOBER 20, 1949)

Since this article was completed (Sept. 10, 1949), some new facts have become known which modify a few details of the preceding account. The discovery of the cave was due to the merest chance—a wandering goat led two Bedouin shepherds to the place (Library of Congress information office: Press release No. 611, p. 2). Thus another instance of accidental discovery of something most important to be added to the list of such cases of chance (cf. for instance the discovery of the ancient city of Mari: A. Parrot: *Mari une ville perdue* (Paris, 1948), pp. 17 ff.). It has been ascertained that what looked like the use of pitch or some such substance on the scrolls is in fact the result of coagulation or natural decay of the leather itself. Thus, Dr. Plenderleith, archaeological chemist of the British Museum, who confirmed previous remarks to that effect of Mr. L. Harding (B. A., (Sept., 1949), p. 65). Hence the remarks in our text concerning the use of pitch as a means of preserving the MSS are incorrect. This however does not invalidate the other evidence of the manifest care taken by the original owners to save the scrolls.

According to B.A. (pp. 56 and 65) one of the scrolls of the Jewish Collection contains Isaias 44-66. We have therefore one complete copy of Isaias and in addition practically the whole second part of the book in the two pre-Christian MSS. The second MS does not have the *scriptio plena* so characteristic of the other scroll. We must wait for the publication of the texts in order to be able to gauge accurately the relations between these two scrolls and the traditional text. As stated above in the article, the Fourth Scroll of the Syrian Collection was found to be in Aramaic. A report in the *Washington Post* (Oct. 19, 1949) states, on the authority of Dr. Trever, that one of the MSS, evidently of the Syrian Collection, in Aramaic, contains the Book of Lamech. This must be the Fourth Scroll described before as unidentified. It will be valuable as giving us an apocryphal work of which only the title was known. Its importance is not its contribution to Biblical history, which can only be nil, but its contribution to our knowledge of Jewish religious thought in the last century B.C. The

presence of that apocryphon in the collection of the cave is another proof of the interest of the group which owned the library in apocryphal literature. But its special significance may be rather in the language itself. We may have in this Aramaic document a form of Aramaic which will bring us closer to the vernacular of Palestine in the time of Christ. It may have some bearing on the Aramaic substratum of the words of Christ. In this country, the authenticity of the discovery had been challenged notably by Dr. Zeitlin in the *Jew. Quart. Rev.* (1948-49): "Commentary on the Book of Habakkuk: Important discovery or hoax?" (pp. 235-47), and: "Scholarship and the Hoax of the Recent Discoveries" (p. 337-63). At the meeting of the American Oriental Society at Yale (April 5-7, 1949), Zeitlin's scepticism met with some support, chiefly on the part of Dr. Orlinsky who argued against the antiquity of the Isaias Scroll by appealing to the circumstances of the discovery, the characteristics of the text and palaeography. His conclusion was that the MS. belong to some date after 500 A.D. Dr. Albright, present at the meeting, maintained the authenticity of the find. It would seem that at the time of the Yale meeting the details of the examination of the cave by Dr. de Vaux and Mr. Harding,—in which Dr. Sellers of the American School also took part—were not known generally. The thorough examination of the cave should go a long way towards establishing solidly the genuineness of the discovery, even if some circumstances still need clarification. But such a discussion is not in vain, since it will help to focus attention on doubtful points and in the end, we trust, to place the facts beyond reasonable doubt. The importance of the discovery makes necessary a most thorough examination of the evidence.

EDWARD P. ARBEZ

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

MISSION INTENTION

"Catholic Church work among American Negroes" is the Mission Intention for March, 1950.

THE STATUS OF ST. ROBERT BELLARMINE'S TEACHING ABOUT THE MEMBERSHIP OF OCCULT HERETICS IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

St. Robert Bellarmine defended and consolidated, although he did not by any means originate, the teaching that actual membership in the Church militant depended exclusively upon those factors which Catholic theologians group together under the heading of the external or bodily bond of unity with Christ and with His Church. St. Robert held that all and only those who retained an outward and public Catholic profession of faith, an ecclesiastical communion in or access to the sacraments, and subjection to the rule of legitimate ecclesiastical superiors could rightfully and properly be designated as parts or members of the true Church of Christ on earth. A man who possessed these characteristics would remain a member of the Church, albeit an utterly unworthy one, even though secretly guilty of the sins of heresy or apostasy, and thus devoid of all supernatural life whatever.[1]

With varying degrees of emphasis, the text books most frequently employed in American theological seminaries support St. Robert's teaching on conditions for membership in the Church on earth. Billot, Hervé, Tanquerey, and Van Noort are in substantial agreement on this point.[2] Since these manuals are used in the theological formation of a great many American candidates for the priesthood, it is only reasonable to conclude, in the absence of any contrary indication, that a very large proportion of American priests have been taught, and have made their own, the opinion which holds that a man who is united to the Church by the external bonds of unity remains a member of this society, even though he be an occult heretic.

Thus it is necessarily a matter of interest and of concern to the priests of the United States to find St. Robert's opinion about

[1] Cf. St. Robert's *De ecclesia militante*, c. 2.

[2] Cf. Billot, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi*, 5th edition (Rome: Gregorian University, 1927), I, 296 ff.; Hervé, *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae*, 18th edition (Paris: Berche et Pagis, 1934), I, 455 f.; Tanquerey, *Synopsis theologiae dogmaticae fundamentalis*, 24th edition (Paris: Desclée, 1937), p. 671; Van Noort, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi*, 5th edition (Hilversum, Holland: Paul Brand, 1932), p. 174.

requisites for membership in the Church subjected to a sharp and radical criticism by a competent theologian. Very recently Fr. Francis X. Lawlor, S.J., has written in Theological Studies and has "endeavored to show that according to the teaching of the encyclical [*Mystici corporis*], occult heresy is incompatible with membership in the visible Church of Christ." [3] If Fr. Lawlor has been successful in his effort, and has actually brought forward valid evidence that St. Robert's teaching on this matter is even by implication opposed to the doctrine of the *Mystici corporis*, then it is manifestly the business of every priest who has hitherto followed St. Robert to reconsider his judgment on this particular point. At any event, it is now imperative to re-examine the question and to look at St. Robert's teaching against its own background, and ultimately to see what the encyclical *Mystici corporis* has actually taught about the point at issue.

The world of scholastic theology did not give any very detailed treatment of the question about requisites for membership in the Church until well into the fourteenth century. St. Robert and his contemporaries never thought of appealing to any scholastic authorities prior to Cardinal John de Turrecremata and Thomas Netter of Walden. The latter was one of the first proponents of the teaching later popularized by St. Robert himself. The former, although sometimes quoted in opposition to St. Robert and his followers, limited his explicit teaching on this particular point to the general statement that the faithful were within the Church and that heretics were not.

By the latter part of the sixteenth century, however, theologians had come to recognize two distinct sections of the teaching about requirements for membership in the Church militant. There were certain questions to which the Church itself had given definitive replies, questions to which certain Catholic dogmas were the only possible responses. Thus all of the Catholic theologians of their time and since have unanimously taught that a man may be a member of the Church militant if he is in the state of mortal sin, even of extraordinarily grave mortal sin, and that he may be a member even though he is not predestined to enjoy the beatific vision.

[3] The article is entitled "Occult Heresy and Membership in the Church." The citation is from *Theological Studies*, X, 4 (Dec. 1949), 553.

Other questions with reference to membership in the Church were open to free discussion. Our sixteenth and seventeenth century theologians took full advantage of that freedom. They offered theories which differed very sharply from one another, but which may be classified with some degree of adequacy under four general headings.

First there were those who, with the great Dominican Thomas de Vio Cardinal Cajetan and with the eminent Spanish Franciscan controversialist Alphonsus a Castro, made no effective distinction between membership in the church and subjection to it, and who thus classified all baptized persons, indiscriminately, as parts or members of the true Church.[4] They held that the baptismal character constituted even a public apostate or heretic a genuine member of the Church.

St. Robert is by far the best known representative of the second group. Taking cognizance of the existence of two distinct sets of factors, the inward or spiritual and the outward or bodily bonds of unity, both of which tended to attach a man to Christ, St. Robert insisted upon and, as a matter of fact built his book *De ecclesia militante* around, the thesis that it is the outward bond alone, to the entire exclusion of the inward, which constitutes a man as a part or a member of the Church militant.[5] In supporting this thesis, he followed the lead of Thomas Netter of Walden, of John Driedo, of Peter a Soto, and of Melchior Cano. Netter interprets St. Augustine in favor of his thesis that one who has destroyed within himself "the most true and most established faith of the Church, remains a son of the Church as long as he is not cast out from the communion of the sacraments."[6] Although he makes no express reference to occult heretics, Driedo insists that "all of those who are held as visibly attached to the Church by the sacrament of faith, in a kind of peaceful way consorting bodily with the Christian people, are said to be within the Church until they are

[4] Cf. Cajetan, *De comparatione auctoritatis papae et concilii*, c. 22, in Cajetan's *Scripta theologica*, edited by Fr. Pollet (Rome: Angelico, 1936), I, 142 f.: Alphonsus a Castro, *De iusta haereticorum punitione*, Lib. III, c. 24, in the *Opera Alphonsi a Castro* (Paris, 1571), column 1392.

[5] Cf. *De ecclesia militante, loc. cit.*

[6] *Antiquitatum fidei catholicae ecclesiae doctrinale*, Lib. II, a. 2, in the Blanciotti edition (Venice, 1758), I, 292.

cut off by the Church's judgment or until they leave it of their own accord, despising and persecuting the Church." [7]

Peter a Soto believed and taught that "neither grace, nor certainly any interior hidden virtue was required in members" of the Church, and that, as a matter of fact, nothing was requisite apart from "the public and legitimate profession of faith and the vocation." [8] Cano insisted that "catechumens are not part of this Church, and that all of those who have the baptismal character are parts, unless they have been cut off by the public judgment of the Church after external heresy." [9] Cano differed from Soto and from St. Robert in insisting upon the necessity of the baptismal character in a member of the Church. All of them, however, believed that a man is constituted as a member of the Church through the possession of the outward bond, and that true inward faith is neither requisite nor sufficient to establish a man as a member.

Francis Suarez is almost alone in his defence of the third opinion. Where St. Robert had taught that the outward bond of unity alone constituted a man as a member of the Church, Suarez taught, on the contrary that faith, the basic element of the inward bond, was the only absolute requisite. In perfect consistency with this position, he held that while a secret sin which destroys the virtue of faith puts a man out of the Church, a catechumen who has the virtue of faith should be counted as a member.[10]

Speaking of the thesis that both faith and some external bond are necessary to constitute a man a member of the Church, Suarez says that: *modus hic loquendi, de quo forte est tota quaestio magis quam de re, mihi non satis probatur.*[11] He describes his teaching on the membership in the Church of catechumens endowed with

[7] *De ecclesiasticis scripturis et dogmatibus,* Lib. IV, c. 2, part 2 (Louvain, 1533), p. 517.

[8] *Assertio catholicae fidei circa articulos confessionis nomine illustrissimi Ducis Wirtenbergensis oblatae per legatos eius Concilio Tridentino,* c. *De ecclesia.* Neither the pages nor the sections of this edition (Cologne, 1555) are numbered.

[9] *De locis theologicis,* Lib. IV, c. 2, in the *Opera theologica* (Rome, 1900), I, 201.

[10] Cf. *Opus de triplici virtute theologica* (Lyons, 1621), De fide, disp. 9, sect. 1, pp. 160 f. Suarez, incidentally, insists that a catechumen who has the faith but who has never manifested it in any way remains a member of the Church.

[11] *Ibid.,* p. 159.

the virtue of divine faith as something which *mihi tamen magis placet.*[12] Thus, since he merely states that his own position was more pleasing to him, that he did not consider the arguments against it conclusive, and that the whole dispute might well be a matter of terminology rather than of real import, it is easy to see that Suarez' denial of the necessity of the external bond of unity in a member of the Church was proposed only as a tenuous opinion.

The fourth opinion was given its adequate form by Francis Sylvius. It held that no man could be a member of the Catholic Church unless he possessed the outward bonds of unity, the baptismal profession of faith, the communion of the sacraments, and subjection to legitimate ecclesiastical authority, but taught, at the same time, that true internal faith was also required.[13] The men who held this opinion differed from Suarez in denying membership in the Church to catechumens. They opposed St. Robert in teaching that occult heresy was incompatible with real membership in the Church. Sylvius added that no man could be a real part or member of the Church unless he had a certain *amor fraternitatis,* an affection for the Church and for its membership separable from and inferior to the theological virtue of charity.[14] He believed that this *amor fraternitatis* constituted, along with faith itself, the basic inward bond of unity requisite for membership in the Church.

Both St. Robert and Suarez listed Turrecremata as an authority denying that occult heretics could be members of the true Church. St. Robert, however, very properly insisted that the section of Turrecremata's *Summa de ecclesia* which was generally supposed to refer to this question might possibly have nothing at all to do with it.[15] Again St. Robert, and Suarez after him, list the Cardinal Hosius as teaching that occult heretics can be members of the Church. Here both were manifestly mistaken.

[12] *Ibid.,* p. 160.

[13] Cf. *De praecipuis fidei nostrae orthodoxae controversiis cum nostris haereticis,* Lib. III, q. 1, articles 2, 3, and 7, in Sylvius' *Opera Omnia* (Antwerp, 1698), V, 236 ff.

[14] Cf. St. Robert, *op. cit.,* c. 10, column 134. The older theologians believed that what Turrecremata had said in his *Summa de ecclesia* (Venice, 1561), Lib. IV, part 2, c. 20, p. 393v, could be applied to this question.

[15] Cf. *op. cit.,* a. 2, p. 237.

Hosius had encountered Brentius' contention that an occult heretic could not really belong to the true Church, but could only appear to belong. The Cardinal believed that he was answering this contention when he insisted that "Nothing prevents us from holding, for a true member of the Church, him in whom we acknowledge a public and legitimate profession of faith and vocation, even though he be not a true member in the eyes of God."[16] Sylvius appeals to Hosius, and to Bannez and Lens as well, as authorities in support of his own thesis that "heretics and schismatics, however occult they may be, are not in the Church truly and absolutely, but only after a fashion (*secundum quid*), that is, according to outward appearance and according to the external reception of the sacraments." [17]

James Latomus had contented himself with an out and out denial of membership to all heretics, occult or otherwise.[18] Later theologians, however, seemed somewhat embarrassed by the problem of the two different bonds of unity. All of the important writers except Suarez were ready to deny that a man could be a member of the Church if he possessed faith, that is, the basic element in the inward or spiritual bond of unity, without possessing the outward or bodily bond. Those who would not acknowledge, as St. Robert did, that a man who possessed the outward bond without any trace of the inward was actually a member of the Church, were driven to strain their vocabularies in an attempt to explain that such a person was still at least legitimately considered an apparent member. Stapleton insisted that the occult heretic belonged to the Church *secundum quid*, at least by reason of the sacramental character.[19] Wiggers, choosing between the opinion of St. Robert and that ascribed to Turrecremata, states flatly that St. Robert's theory is more common and that it seems more consonant with the writings of the ancients.[20] He holds that occult

[16] *Confutatio prolegomenon Brentii* (Lyons, 1564), c. 5, p. 455. Cf. Bernacki, *La doctrine de l'église chez le Cardinal Hosius* (Paris: Gabalda, 1936), p. 35.

[17] *Op. cit.*, a. 7, p. 242.

[18] Cf. *De ecclesia et humanae legis obligatione*, c. 2, in the *Opera* (Louvain, 1579), p. 94r.

[19] Cf. *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium relectio scholastica et compendiaria* (Antwerp, 1596), Controversia I, q. 2, a. 3, pp. 15 f.

[20] Cf, *Commentaria de virtutibus theologicis* (Louvain, 1689), *tractatus de ecclesia*, ad q. 1, a. 10, p. 111.

heretics seem to be parts and members of the Church only in an imperfect way and, as it were, by way of analogy.[21] Gregory of Valentia, somewhat hesitantly, and Adam Tanner, quite vigorously, also denied membership in the Church to these hidden heretics.[22] Sylvius gave explicit utterance to the principle that guided all these men when he taught that "by reason of the inward [bond of union] a man is a member of the Church *simpliciter et absolute,* but by reason of the outward [bond] only *secundum quid et improprie.*" [23]

It must be recalled, however, that serious theological opposition to St. Robert's thesis on the status of occult heretics followed the line of the opinion elaborated by Sylvius rather than that of the one presented by Suarez. Despite Suarez' tremendous and well-deserved influence in the world of sacred theology, his opinion about conditions for membership in the Church was destined, for all intents and purposes, to die with him. No future theologian of any moment was to be found to teach that internal faith was the one actual requisite for membership in the true Church, and thus to hold that catechumens who possessed the faith were members of the Church and that occult heretics were not.

In the same way, the first of the opinions once current among Catholic scholars that were supported by Cajetan and by Alphonsus a Castro, did not survive the Counter-Reformation period. Thus only two of the four theories regarding membership in the Church have come down to our own time. The two surviving opinions are the one which was taught by St. Robert and that which was presented by Sylvius.

Both of these two opinions have been upheld continuously by competent theologians since the early part of the seventeenth century, when Adam Tanner declared his own teaching to be more widely received and John Wiggers wrote, on the contrary, that St. Robert's theory was more commonly held.[24] Strangely enough, Tanner seems to have been the last important theologian to have judged the teaching that denies membership in the Church to

[21] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 112.

[22] Cf. Valentia, *Commentaria theologica* (Ingolstadt, 1603), III, column 166; Tanner, *Theologia scholastica* (Ingolstadt, 1627), III, column 136.

[23] *Op. cit.*, a. 7, p. 242.

[24] Cf. Tanner, *loc. cit.*; Wiggers, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

occult heretics as more common than its opposite. The number of subsequent theologians who adopted the teaching set forth by Peter a Soto and by St. Robert was markedly greater than that of the men who preferred the teaching of Tanner and of Sylvius on this point, although the latter opinion never lacked strong support from very able ecclesiologists.

Thus, during the eighteenth century, St. Robert's teaching could claim the support of such eminent writers as Tournely, and Regnier,[25] while Sylvius' opinion was upheld by the tremendously influential Billuart.[26] During the nineteenth century such theological giants as Perrone, Cardinal Mazzella, Palmieri, and Cercia[27] agreed with St. Robert that occult heretics were members of the Church. In the most complete treatment given to this question in all the manuals of theology during the nineteenth century, however, Murray concludes by rejecting this teaching which, at the same time he admits is *longe communior*.[28] Tepe and Hurter followed Franzelin in declaring that the occult heretic is not properly and truly a member of the Church, but belongs to it only in appearance.[29] They thereby renewed in the nineteenth century a teaching which Hosius had proposed in the the sixteenth. Franzelin, incidentally, popularized the process of distinguishing between formal and material heresy in treating of conditions for membership

[25] Cf. Tournely, *Praelectiones theologicae de ecclesia Christi* (Paris, 1765), I, 299; Regnier, *De ecclesia Christi,* in Migne's *Theologiae cursus completus,* IV, columns 1095 ff.

[26] Cf. *Summa Sancti Thomae hodiernis academiarum moribus accommodata sive cursus theologiae juxta mentem Divi Thomae, de regulis fidei* diss. 3, a. 2, in the edition of Paris, 1904, V, 97 f.

[27] Cf. Perrone, *Praelectiones theologicae* (Rome, 1835), I, 298; Mazzella, *De religione et ecclesia,* 6th edition (Prato, 1905), pp. 470 ff.; Palmieri *Tractatus de Romano Pontifice cum prolegomeno de ecclesia,* 2nd edition (Prato, 1891), pp. 47 ff.; Cercia, *Demonstratio catholica,* 5th edition (Paris, 1878), I, 72 ff. It must be admitted that the teaching of many of these men was considerably weakened by their use of a now discarded theory of the body and the soul of the Church.

[28] Cf. *De ecclesia Christi* (Dublin, 1860), I, 193 ff.

[29] Cf. Franzelin, *Theses de ecclesia Christi* (Rome, 1887), pp. 407 f.; Tepe, *Institutiones theologicae in usum scholarum* (Paris, 1894), I, 369 f.; Hurter, *Theologiae dogmaticae compendium,* 2nd edition (Innsbruck, 1878), I, 206 f.

in the Church. He thereby did a definite disservice to the cause of theology.[30]

It is interesting to note that only one serious effort was made to advance the explanation of this teaching during the period intervening between the seventeenth and the twentieth centuries. This tentative was made by Peter Dens, who held that occult heresy excluded a man from membership in the Church when it was outwardly expressed, but not when it was merely internal.[31]

By far the greater number of theological text books which deal with the question and which have been written or have been in use during the first half of our own century strongly favor the opinion of St. Robert. D'Herbigny, Egger, Van Noort, Herrmann, and Saiz Ruiz speak of it as a more common teaching.[32] Blanch holds that it is more probable and more common, while Archbishop Mazzella follows his illustrious namesake in designating the thesis as *longe communior*.[33] Tanquerey and De Guibert insist that St. Robert's opinion is taught commonly, and Pesch, Hervé, and Manzoni declare that it is taught more commonly.[34] Vellico believes that hardly any modern theologian holds with Suarez in denying that occult heretics are actually members of the Catholic Church.[35] Billot, Dieckmann, Zubizarreta, Bainvel, Vives, Felder, Schultes, Paris, Lercher, Crosta, and Casanova are among the other modern

[30] For a discussion of this point see Fenton, "Membership in the Church," in *AER*, CXII, 4 (April, 1945), 297 f.

[31] Cf. *Theologia ad usum seminariorum et sacrae theologiae alumnorum*, 10th edition (Malines, 1880), II, 361.

[32] Cf. D'Herbigny, *Theologica de ecclesia*, 3rd edition (Paris: Beauchesne, 1928), II, 268 f.; Egger, *Enchiridion theologiae dogmaticae generalis*, 6th edition (Brescia, 1932), 423 f.; Van Noort, *loc. cit.*, Hermann, *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae, 7th edition* (Lyons, Vitte, 1937), I, 346; Saiz Ruiz, *Synthesis sive notae theologiae fundamentalis* (Burgos, 1906), p. 334.

[33] Cf. Blanch, *Theologia generalis* (Barcelona, 1901), pp. 294 ff.; Horatius Mazzella, *Praelectiones scholastico-dogmaticae, 6th edition* (Turin, 1944), I, 415 ff.

[34] Cf. Tanquerey, *loc. cit.;* De Guibert, *De Christi ecclesia*, 2nd edition (Rome: Gregorian, 1928), p. 148; Pesch, *Praelectiones dogmaticae*, 6th edition (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1924), I, 229; Hervé, *loc. cit.;* Manzoni, *Compendium theologiae dogmaticae*, 4th edition (Turin, 1928), I, 201.

[35] Cf. *De ecclesia Christi* (Rome: Arnodo, 1940), p. 543.

theologians who support this teaching.[36] The most important writers in opposition have been MacGuinness, Michelitsch, and Fraghi, the latter the author of a valuable dissertation *De membris ecclesiae* published a few years ago at the Angelico in Rome.[37]

Fr. Lawlor's recent article has strongly bolstered this still unsubdued opposition to St. Robert's thesis. He contends that "though the question of occult heresy is not formally treated [in the *Mystici corporis*], there is nevertheless solid evidence that the encyclical demands such [internal] faith as an essential requirement for real membership in the visible Church." [38]

Even though they may not agree with Fr. Lawlor, American theologians have every reason to be grateful to him for his statement on this question. Not only has he brought up a hitherto unheard of objection against the commonly received teaching about membership in the Church, but he has also stated, as clearly as they can be set forth, the older foundations of opposition to St. Robert's theory. His article should, and most probably will, prove to be an important contribution towards a settlement of the problem with which it deals.

In some future paper it may be possible to review the arguments which the classical theologians have employed to defend St. Robert's opinion on this point, as well as the arguments which have been used against it. At this time, however, it is our intention merely to look into the effect produced by the Holy Father's encyc-

[36] Cf. Billot, *loc. cit.;* Dieckmann, *De ecclesia tractatus historico-dogmatici* (Freiburg in Breisgau: Herder, 1925), II, 255 f.; Zubizarreta, *Theologia dogmatico-scholastica,* 3rd edition (Bilbao, 1937), I, 444 ff.; Bainvel, *De ecclesia Christi* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1925), pp. 109 f.; Vives, *Compendium theologiae dogmaticae,* 4th edition (Rome: Pustet, 1905), p. 83; Felder, *Apologetica sive theologia fundamentalis,* 2nd edition (Paderborn: Schoeningh, 1923), II, 45; Schultes, *De ecclesia catholica* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1931), p. 94; Paris, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* (Turin, 1929), p. 42; Lercher, *Institutiones thologiae dogmaticae,* 2nd edition (Innsbruck: Rauch, 1934), I, 427 ff.; Crosta, *Theologia dogmatica,* 3rd edition (Gallarate, 1932), I, 202 ff.; Casanova, *Theologia fundamentalis* (Rome, 1899), pp. 268 f.

[37] Cf. MacGuinness, *Commentarii theologici,* 3rd edition (Paris: Lethielleux, 1930), I, 227 ff.; Michelitsch, *Elementa apologeticae sive theologiae fundamentalis,* 3rd edition (Graz, 1925), pp. 329 ff.; Fraghi, *De membris ecclesiae* (Rome, 1937), pp. 90 ff. MacGuinness admits that St. Robert's teaching is *"longe communior."*

[38] *Op. cit.,* p. 547.

lical *Mystici corporis* upon the controversy about the possibility that an occult heretic can be a member of the true Church.

It must be admitted that Fr. Lawlor's judgment on this point is quite forceful. He speaks of "a dissociation, at least partial, between the visible Church and the Mystical Body of Christ" as a "consequence" following upon the defence of St. Robert's position.[39] He concludes his article with the remark that "When the question [of occult heresy and membership in the Church] is so proposed that it involves not merely a matter of suitable nomenclature but rather a partial dissociation between the visible Church and the Mystical Body of Christ, then it seems clear that in the light of the recent encyclical it is no longer safe doctrine." [40] In the light of what he had previously declared to be a consequence of St. Robert's teaching, it is difficult to interpret this last statement by Fr. Lawlor other than as at least an oblique charge that St. Robert's teaching has been rendered unacceptable among Catholics by the *Mystici corporis*.

In this connection it is interesting to note that three important theological manuals which have been published since the appearance of the *Mystici corporis* all teach with St. Robert that an occult heretic can be a member of the true Church. It would be astonishing to discover, at this comparatively late date, that Msgr. Parente and Fathers Yelle and Calcagno[41] had all taught a doctrine incompatible with the teaching of a highly important papal document which had appeared prior to the publication of their works. It would be more than astonishing to find that these estimable theologians were engaged in teaching what is no longer safe doctrine.

In the only part of the *Mystici corporis* dealing directly with the question of membership, the Holy Father teaches that "Actually only those are to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith, and who have

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 542.

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 554.

[41] All three follow St. Robert's teaching on this point. Cf. Parente, *Theologiae fundamentalis* (Rome: Marietti, 1946), p. 171; Yelle, *De ecclesia et de locis theologicis* (Montreal: Grand Seminary, 1945), pp. 50 f.; Calcagno, *Theologia fundamentalis* (Naples: D'Auria, 1948), p. 207. Parente teaches this doctrine as more probable, Calcagno as more common, and Yelle presents it without qualification.

not been so unfortunate as to separate themselves from the unity of the Body, or been excluded by legitimate authority for grave faults committed." [42] This statement is incompatible with the individual position of Francis Suarez, who held that catechumens could be members of the Church, but it is quite compatible with the positions of both St. Robert and Francis Sylvius. Both of these theologians held that only people who conformed to the description which the Holy Father incorporated into his encyclical should be considered as real members of the Church. Sylvius and his associates, however, were convinced that these were not the only characteristics requisite for constituting a man as a member of the true Church of Jesus Christ on earth. The theory championed by St. Robert, on the other hand, held and holds that only these factors are necessary.

Strangely enough, Fr. Lawlor believes that the very paragraph of the encyclical within which the statement about membership is found contains evidence that "its teaching on the minimal requirements of real membership differs essentially from that of Bellarmine." [43] He bases this claim upon the fact that the Holy Father cites in this paragraph two scriptural passages "which are taken from a context wherein are found exhortations to unity grounded on the truth that we are one Body vivified by one Spirit," [44] and upon the Holy Father's assertion that "those who are divided in faith or government cannot be living in the unity of such a Body, nor can they be living the life of its one Divine Spirit." [45]

The fact that the Vicar of Christ speaks of one Spirit and one faith in the Christian community has, of course, nothing whatever to do with the question about the possibility of membership in the Church on the part of an occult heretic. All that the Holy Father teaches is that the members, who have at least the qualifications he has indicated in the first sentence of this paragraph, dwell within a community in which "there is only one Body, one Spirit, one Lord, one Baptism," and in which, consequently, "there can be only one faith." He makes no effort whatsoever to

[42] From the *NCWC* translation, n. 22. The original text is to be found in *AAS*, XXXV (July 20, 1943), 202 .

[43] *Op. cit.*, p. 547.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 548.

[45] *Ibid.*

state or to imply that absolutely every member of the Church actually possesses true faith.

Even less verisimilitude appears in the claim that the *Mystici corporis* is incompatible with St. Robert's teaching by virtue of the fact that it denies that people who are divided from one another in faith and government can be living in one Body of this sort or can be living by its one Divine Spirit. The statement to the effect that a person completely divided from the Body cannot be living by the Spirit in no way involves the assertion or the implication that every one of those who lives in the Body, that is in the Church itself, actually lives the supernatural life in any degree whatever.

In the encyclical, the Holy Father speaks of schism, heresy, and apostasy, as sins which, of their very nature, separate a man from the Body of the Church. He thereby follows the traditional procedure adopted by St. Robert himself in his *De ecclesia militante.* The great Doctor of the Church devoted the fourth chapter of his book to a proof that heretics and apostates are not members of the Church. The tenth chapter of the same work is nothing more or less than a demonstration of the fact that *occult* infidels or heretics are really members. Thus, in utilizing the very procedure of St. Robert, the Holy Father can certainly not be considered as contradicting his special conclusion. In writing what St. Robert included in his fourth chapter, the Holy Father must not be considered as denying what the same great Doctor of the Church taught in the tenth chapter of the same book.

Furthermore, there is no objectively acceptable reason for interpreting the Holy Father's pronouncements about the presence of sinners in the Church, and about the fact that many sins which drive divine charity from the soul do not destroy Christian faith, as meaning that every person who is actually a member of the Church possesses true and inward divine faith. Nor is there any justification for the process of interpreting the places in the *Mystici corporis* in which Our Lord or the Holy Ghost are represented as communicating life to the *singula membra* of the Church, as declarations that no man can be a member of the Church unless he possesses at least the true and inward divine faith. Unfortunately the English translations sometimes speak of this expression as meaning "each of the members." Such an interpretation is, however, quite incorrect. There is no place in the *Mystici*

corporis in which there is either a clear statement or a genuine implication that each and every member of the true Church must be in possession of true and inward faith, and that consequently an occult heretic cannot be considered as a true member of the Church.

Certainly the *Mystici corporis* did not incorporate the teaching of St. Robert about the membership of occult heretics into the Church into the body of pontifical doctrine. But, by the same token, neither did it in any way deny or discourage St. Robert's opinion on this point. Any advance towards a solution of the problem itself will have to be made, since the publication of the encyclical itself has made no direct contribution, along the lines of the evidence which has been under consideration by the classical theologians since the seventeenth century.

In this connection, however, it is well to remember that we have been limiting our discussion to St. Robert's teaching about the possibility that occult heretics might be real members of the Catholic Church. It is our contention that the *Mystici corporis* in no way either implied or involved a rejection of this particular section of St. Robert's doctrine. What we have said in no way applies to St. Robert's teaching on the conditions for membership in the Church when this teaching is considered altogether, as a unit.

St. Robert was perfectly in line with a then existent theological tradition in holding that a man could be a true member of the Catholic Church when he possessed the outward bond of unity with the Church, apart altogether from the inward bond. He believed that a man was a real member of the Church when he had this outward bond of union, even though he had no true and inward Christian faith whatsoever.

He differed, however, from other ecclesiologists of his time in his concept of the outward bond itself. He held literally and consistently that these factors which were capable of making a man a member of the true Church and sufficient to constitute him such were the profession of the Christian faith and the communion or reception of the sacraments, under the direction of legitimate ecclesiastical pastors, and ultimately, under the leadership of the Roman Pontiff. He definitely did not teach that the baptismal character was necessary for real membership in the Church.

He definitely taught that those "who have not given their names to Christ through baptism, but who follow other religions,"[46] are not members of the Church. He also denied that catechumens, those who were preparing for the reception of baptism, and thus for entrance into the true Church of Christ, were members of the kingdom of God on earth. But, in the light of what he has set down towards the end of the tenth chapter in his *De ecclesia militante,* it is obvious that he considered an unbaptized man a true member of the Church when that man lived in society as a Catholic and was accepted as such, either by reason of a mistake about his status, or because the man cold-bloodedly falsified his position, claiming to have been baptized when he knew well that he had never received the sacrament.

It is manifest that this particular aspect of St. Robert's teaching is unacceptable in the light of the *Mystici corporis.* It must be remembered, however, that St. Robert's faulty description of the Church's outward bond of unity in no way militates against his teaching about the possibility that occult heretics can be members of the true Church, and in no way invalidates the arguments he employed in favor of that contention.

The opinion that a man devoid of faith can be a real member of the Catholic Church is recognized, even by those who do not accept it, as being more commonly held than its opposite. As a *doctrina communior* it has a sort of privileged status in the field of Catholic theology. A man should be armed with a particularly strong set of reasons in order to attempt legitimately to destroy it.

It is, of course, the privilege of any theologian to prefer the arguments advanced for Sylvius' thesis to those which tend to show that occult heretics can be members of the Catholic Church. In the present status of dogmatic theology, however, it is somewhat presumptuous to assert that any arguments which have hitherto been employed on the other side have rendered St. Robert's position untenable.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[46] Cf. *De ecclesia militante,* c. 10.

Answers to Questions

GESTURES TO BE MADE BY THE SERVER

Question: Is it correct for the server at Low Mass to make the sign of the cross whenever it is made by the celebrant and likewise to bow when the latter does so, e.g. at the *Gloria Patri,* the name of Jesus, and that of the saint of the day? Are these things matters of custom or are they provided for by the rubrics?

Answer: The *Ritus servandus* of the Missal says nothing about the gestures mentioned by our correspondent. However, universal custom, supported by liturgical authorities, has the server make the sign of the cross and bow the head whenever the celebrant does so, at least when the latter is using the loud voice (*vox clara*). This is the direction given by Wapelhorst (*Compendium S. Liturgiae,* 131, 5); Martinucci (*Manuale S. Caeremoniarum,* Lib. I, Cap. xi, 8, 10); Fortescue (*Ceremonies of the Roman Rite,* p. 84) and Baldeschi (*Le Sacre Cerimonie,* II, Cap. iii, 18) and writers generally.

THE MANUAL ACTS AT MASS

Question: What is to be understood by the "manual acts" which are mentioned by authors like Fortescue and Anglican liturgical scholars like Brightman?

Answer: Etymologically, manual acts naturally mean those whose performance involves the use of the hands. In this sense, all the gestures used by the priest during the celebration of Mass, such as extending or joining the hands, tracing the sign of the cross, or striking the breast may be called manual acts. Technically speaking, however, *the* manual acts are restricted by liturgical authorities to actions of manipulation of the Sacred Species. Hence, the chief manual acts are those of elevating the Host and the Chalice, the breaking of the Host, the commixture of the two Sacred Species by dropping the particle into the chalice, and the signs of the cross made with the consecrated Host. The expression, though quite apt, is more common with Anglican than with Catholic writers on liturgy.

THE SIGN OF THE CROSS AT THE END OF PRAYERS

Question: There seems to be considerable diversity of practice in the matter of making the sign of the cross with the words: "In the name of the Father, etc." at the end of a series of prayers as well as at the beginning. For instance, some priests conclude the prayers after Low Mass with the sign of the cross and the words: "In the name of the Father, etc." and, similarly, they bless themselves at the end of a sermon. Which is more correct, to make the sign of the cross after the prayers as well as before them or to use this blessing only at the beginning of prayers?

Answer: The sign of the cross with the formula: "In nomine Patris, etc." will be found prescribed in liturgical books only for the beginning of devotions. If any sign of the cross is to be made at the end of liturgical prayers, the words used are in the form of a blessing beginning with *Benedictio Dei* or *Benedicat vos.* In no case do we find a sign of the cross at the end of a liturgical devotion made with the accompanying words "In nomine Patris." If the liturgical prescriptions are to furnish the norm for non-liturgical devotions, we conclude that it would be more correct not to make the sign of the cross at the end of such devotions but only at the beginning. If, however, the cross is made, in conformity with custom, it would be more accurate not to use the words "In the name of the Father, etc." while making it. The official prayers of the Church quite generally begin with a sign of the cross and the words "In the name, etc." but no liturgical prayer is concluded in this fashion.

WHEN ASSISTANT DEACONS ARE NOT AVAILABLE

Question: In my small diocese it often happens that we have not a sufficient number of priests to fill all the positions at Pontifical Mass. In such case, would it be proper to have the deacon and subdeacon sit at the throne beside the bishop in place of the deacons of honor or would it be better to have seminarians, or even larger altar boys, in surplice, attend at the throne to perform the duties of the assistant deacons?

Answer: The reply to the difficulty proposed by His Excellency has already received an official solution in a decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites, No. 3114, dated March 22, 1862.

This was in the form of an answer to a similar question proposed by Bishop Grace, of the then frontier diocese of St. Paul. The reply of the Sacred Congregation was that when because of the paucity of priests it would be difficult to supply all the officers of a Pontifical Mass it would be permissible for the deacon and subdeacon of the Mass to sit at the throne with the celebrating bishop. There they could perform the duties usually assigned to the deacons of honor which are little more than putting the mitre on and off, and removing or replacing the gremial. When both deacon and subdeacon so assisting are away from the throne, as just before the Gospel, the gremial and mitre can well be attended to by the master of ceremonies, who has this same function at this point when Pontifical Mass is celebrated at the faldstool.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

HOLY COMMUNION WITHOUT CONFESSION

Question: If a religious in a small community has been guilty of a sin which *per se* must be confessed before she may receive Holy Communion, and finds it very difficult to get to confession before Mass, may she make an act of perfect contrition and then approach the Holy Table? I am thinking especially of the case in which there is no permanent confessional in the chapel, and of the case in which the priest who says Mass is not the one to whom she would wish to confess even in more favorable circumstances.

Answer: In order that a person may receive Holy Communion lawfully after recovering the state of grace through an act of perfect contrition without sacramental confession, two conditions must be present—lack of a *copia confessarii* and some necessity of receiving Holy Communion (or celebrating Mass) (Can. 856). Now, in the case proposed, though there may be lacking a *copia confessarii* (though this would not necessarily be the case merely because the religious does not wish to confess to a particular priest), there would not be any necessity of receiving Holy Communion, apart from very exceptional circumstances. Certainly, the other religious would be guilty of rash judgment if they concluded that the sister was guilty of mortal sin merely because she abstained from Holy Communion. The Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments, issued on Dec. 8, 1938, com-

mands that the religious superior shall have no word of reproach for those who do not receive, but shall rather see in this a sign of liberty and of a tender and delicate conscience. Moreover, she is not to give any indication that she seems to notice those who go to Communion frequently, and to praise them while blaming the others (cf. Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest,* II [Milwaukee: Bruce, 1943], 213).

THE USE OF A STERILIZING DRUG

Question: I have read that it is possible to sterilize a woman temporarily—for about six months, it is stated—by injections of trophoplastic hormones daily for ten days. The same source states, also, that this method is now being employed extensively in Japan to solve the acute population problem. What is to be said of the morality of this procedure?

Answer: Any process intended directly as a means to eugenic sterilization, whether temporary or permanent, is contrary to the law of God. By eugenic sterilization we mean that which has for its sole immediate purpose the frustrating of conception, as distinct from therapeutic sterilization, whose immediate purpose is the cure of some grave bodily ailment, and punitive sterilization, whose immediate purpose is the punishment of a serious crime. Since the process described by the question is undoubtedly eugenic sterilization, it must be regarded as a violation of the divine law, even though the acts of coition performed by the married couple in the period when the drug is effective are entirely normal.

THE MASS AND FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Question: Do you think that in exhortations given to the faithful to have Masses said for the deceased and for their loved ones—for example, on Mother's and Father's days—there is too much emphasis on the financial consideration, the stipend? I am thinking particularly of advertisements which explain in detail the great number of Masses in which the deceased will be commemorated in return for a stated sum.

Answer: I am strongly of the opinion that the questioner has good grounds for complaint. Of course, the custom of giving a stipend for the celebration of a Mass is perfectly lawful. At the

same time, the Church condemns "every appearance of negotiation or trafficking" (Canon 827) in connection with the asking or receiving of this stipend. It should be noted that even the *appearance* of mercenary transactions is forbidden. In this country, particularly, where the charge is so often made that Catholic priests are mainly concerned with their own financial profit when they urge the faithful to have Masses celebrated, we should be most exact in observing this ruling of the Church. As the questioner indicates, this is especially the case in the matter of advertising novenas of Masses, Masses for the deceased in perpetuity, etc.

PARENTS RECEIVING WITH FIRST COMMUNICANTS

Question: What is to be said of the custom, prevailing in some parishes, of having the parents of each first communicant receive Holy Communion with the child, in the sanctuary or at the altar-rail? Some priests extend this custom to children whose parents cannot or will not receive with them—for example, if they are non-Catholics, divorced, etc.—in such wise that they select a man and a woman from the congregation who will accompany the boy or girl to the altar in the manner described, thus acting, so to say, as proxies for the child's parents.

Answer: It would seem that the influence brought to bear on the parents of the first communicants to persuade them to receive Holy Communion with their boys and girls would be equivalent to the type of moral coercion which was condemned in an instruction of the Congregation of the Sacraments, given Dec. 8, 1938 (cf. Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest,* II [Milwaukee: Bruce, 1943], 208 ff.). This instruction was concerned mainly with coercion exercised on seminarians and religious and on young folks in schools or colleges; but the rules it lays down are evidently based on principles applicable to more general conditions, such as the prescription that superiors must strive "to remove all circumstances which might expose those who do not receive to astonishment from the others." Now, it would surely arouse astonishment and comment in a parish if some of the Catholic parents refused to receive Holy Communion with their children, while all the others accompanied their sons and daughters to the altar. Conse-

quently, some might be induced through human respect to partake of the Blessed Sacrament sacrilegiously.

These objections would not be present if the parents were invited to receive Holy Communion at the Mass in which their children are communicating for the first time, with the understanding that they will approach the altar rail after all the children have received, without observing any definite order. Thus, it would be difficult to know which parents received Holy Communion and which did not.

THE NEW RULING OF CANON 1099

Question: Recently several priests had a discussion as to the meaning of the ruling which lately came from the Holy See, modifying Canon 1099 in such wise that, beginning with Jan. 1, 1949, all who were baptized as Catholics are bound to the canonical form of marriage, even though they were born of non-Catholic parents and were not brought up as Catholics. Some of the priests contended that only those baptized on or after Jan. 1, 1949, are affected by this modification; others claimed that, irrespective of when they were baptized, all who were baptized as Catholics are obliged to observe the canonical form, under penalty of invalidity, if they wish to contract marriage on or after Jan. 1, 1949. Which of these two views is the correct one?

Answer: The second view is the correct one. The modification of Canon 1099, issued as a *Motu proprio* by Pope Pius XII on Aug. 1, 1948, began on the first day of the year 1949 to affect all persons who had been baptized in the Catholic Church, irrespective of when they had received Baptism.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

THE HAPPINESS OF HEAVEN

The possession and enjoyment of God in the Beatific Vision is not the whole happiness of man in heaven; nor is it the only one in which there are different degrees of enjoyment. Our senses, also, as well as our minds, are to be elevated far beyond their present capacities for enjoyment.

—From *The Happiness of Heaven*, by a Father of the Society of Jesus, (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1949), p. 268.

Analecta

The November, 1949, issue of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* reports the allocution delivered by our Holy Father to five hundred physicians from thirty nations, delegates to the Fourth International Congress of Catholic physicians. This allocution, delivered Sept. 29, 1949,[1] while praising the progress made by medicine and the zeal of physicians in seeking new means of alleviating human maladies, insisted that the profession is prostituted in the degree in which it departs from the principles of natural and Christian morality which are based on the dignity of the human body, the superiority of the soul over the body, the brotherhood of mankind, and the sovereign dominion of God over life and its destiny. It was in this allocution that he condemned artificial insemination when the active principle is derived from a man who is not the husband of the woman, and even when he is her husband, if the active principle is derived by means that are forbidden by the natural law. Moreover, he pointed to the fact that the impediment of impotence is not removed by the possibility of artificial insemination.

On Nov. 8, 1949,[2] our Holy Father addressed an Apostolic exhortation to the hierarchy throughout the world, urging incessant prayers that the fruits of peace, charity and justice may be visited on the Holy Land.

Praise of the apostolate of the workingman in behalf of the workingman was the theme of our Holy Father's allocution delivered on Sept. 11, 1949,[3] to the delegates of the Movement of Belgian Christian Workers; in this allocution our Holy Father took occasion to warn against the possibility of the abuse of the power workingmen derive from their organization, an abuse that is capable of producing evils not less reprehensible than those deriving from the abuse of the power latent in capitalism.

In an analogous vein, our Holy Father urged the apostolate of the family to the family in an allocution delivered Sept. 20, 1949,[4] to the delegates of the Congress of the International Union of

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XLI (1949), 557.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 529.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 547.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 551.

Family Societies. In the allocution he particularly praised the purpose of the Union to supply the insufficiencies of the family in the face of modern economic inequalities, the only alternative to the contrary policy of suppressing the family because of its inadequacy in the modern environment.

In noting that the theme of the philosophers before him was, for the purpose of discussion in their Roman sessions, "Humanism and Political Science," our Holy Father, in an allocution delivered Sept. 25, 1949,[5] lauded St. Thomas as the synthesizer of all that is true in humanism and insisted that it is in the Christian concept of humanity that human dignity and human inalienable rights find their surest defense.

The November issue of the *Acta* reports Letters Apostolic of March 25, 1947,[6] in virtue of which St. Timothy, Bishop and Martyr, was constituted a Patron of the Diocese of Termoli.

By letters Apostolic, three churches are reported in the same issue as elevated to the rank of Minor Basilica. By Letters dated Feb. 11, 1949,[7] this honor was conferred on the Cathedral of the Diocese of Faenza; by Letters dated April 8, 1949,[8] on the Church of St. Blase, in Finalborgo of the Diocese of Savona; and by Letters dated June 10, 1949,[9] on the Cathedral of the Archdiocese of Saint-Boniface, Canada.

Changes affecting the territorial subdivisions of the Church are reported as follows. By an Apostolic Constitution of April 21, 1949,[10] the Apostolic Prefecture of Chihfeng in China was raised to the rank of a Diocese; by an Apostolic Constitution of May 12, 1949,[11] the Apostolic Prefecture of Kankana was established in the eastern part of the Apostolic Vicariate of French New Guinea, the latter to be known henceforth as the Apostolic Vicariate of Konakria; by an Apostolic Constitution of the same date,[12] the Apostolic Prefecture of Hollandia was established in the northern part of the Vicariate of Dutch New Guinea, the latter to be known henceforth as the Apostolic Vicariate of Amboina; by an Apostolic Constitution of May 14, 1949,[13] the new Diocese of Campina Grande was established in territory taken from the Archdiocese of Parahyba in Brazil; a decree of the Sacred Consistorial Congre-

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 555.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 539.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 541.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 544.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 546.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 531.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 533.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 535.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 536.

gation, dated July 16, 1949,[14] changed the name of the Apostolic Vicariate of Chaco in Paraguay, established on March 11, 1948, to the Apostolic Vicariate of the Most Holy Conception in Paraguay; and by a decree of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, dated July 15, 1949,[15] the territory known as Ghiza in Egypt was taken from the Coptic Diocese of Greater Termopolis and placed under the jurisdiction of the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria.

Three decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites were issued in connection with the progress of three causes of beatification. A decree of March 6, 1949,[16] authorized the introduction of the cause of the Servant of God, Giuseppe Moscati; another decree of the same date[17] accepted the proof of the practice of heroic virtue in the cause of the Venerable Servant of God Rosa Venerini, Foundress of the community of teachers known by her surname; and a decree of March 11, 1949,[18] authorized the introduction of the cause of the Servant of God, Henry Baptist Stanislaus Verjus, before his death in 1892 Titular Bishop of Limira and Coadjutor of the Vicar Apostolic of New Guinea.

Among the appointments of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation there is recorded under date of Sept. 8, 1949, that of Most Rev. Emmet Michael Walsh, formerly Bishop of Charleston, as Titular Bishop of Rhaedesta and Coadjutor, with the right of succession, of the Diocese of Youngstown.

Recent Pontifical Appointments Announced in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*

Prontonotaries Apostolic ad instar participantium:

Jan. 18, 1946: Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Patrick Phelan, of the Diocese of Springfield, Massachusetts.

June 2, 1946: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Vitus J. Masnicki, of the Archdiocese of Newark.

June 2, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. James M. McDonough, Charles A. Martin, Ferdinand A. Schreiber, Maurice F. Griffin, and Joseph J. Schmit, of the Diocese of Cleveland.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 562.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 564.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 565.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 567.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 570.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 563.

Jan. 9, 1949: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Richard T. Crean, of the Diocese of Trenton.

Sept. 22, 1949: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Bernard Anthony Kramer, of the Diocese of Winona.

Domestic Prelates of His Holiness:

June 1, 1944: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Patrick J. O'Donnell, of the Archdiocese of New York.

Nov. 17, 1945: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Patrick J. Concannon and Timothy Manning, of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles (the latter was made Auxiliary Bishop Aug. 3, 1946).

Jan. 21, 1946: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Frederick J. Allchin, Mark C. Driscoll, Henry J. Filion, Eric F. MacKenzie, Thomas R. McCoy, John J. McGarry, and John E. Sexton, of the Archdiocese of Boston.

Aug. 11, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Daniel A. Laning, Raymond C. Mullen, and William H. Oberste, of the Diocese of Corpus Christi.

Oct. 20, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. David J. Dooling, Jerome F. McCarty, and William H. Purcell, of the Diocese of Syracuse.

Dec. 9, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgr. John J. O'Neill, of the Diocese of Sioux Falls.

Dec. 13, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Henry Kunig, of the Diocese of Brooklyn; Benjamin H. Staie, of the Diocese of Ogdensburg; and Henry F. Graebenstein, Francis J. Loughran, and William E. Kelly, of the Archdiocese of Washington.

Dec. 20, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Joseph B. Brunini, John J. Burns, Patrick J. Carey, John J. Igoe, and Geoffrey O'Connell, of the Diocese of Natchez.

Jan. 12, 1949: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Edward J. Creager, Francis A. Gressle, Charles W. Kuenle, James F. McNary, and Anthony Moeller, of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati.

April 30, 1949: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John J. Clark, Edward J. Rodenkirch, Joseph P. Heller, James E. Kelly, William P. McDermott, Leo S. Kierstein, Frank M. Schneider, Edward C. Stehling, Anthony J. Weiler, and Clement J. Zych, of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee.

May 16, 1949: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Maurice Foley and Emil Schweier, of the Diocese of Lafayette, Indiana.

May 20, 1949: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Herman E. Mattingly and Francis J. Schwendeman, of the Diocese of Columbus; and Paul D. Weaver and Stanley A. Dobinis, of the Diocese of Harrisburg.

July 17, 1949: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Merlin J. Guilfoyle, of the Archdiocese of San Francisco.

Privy Chamberlains Supernumerary of His Holiness:

Feb. 6, 1943: Very Rev. Msgr. John J. McClafferty, of the Archdiocese of New York.

Aug. 11, 1947: Very Rev. Msgr. Adolph Marx, of the Diocese of Corpus Christi.

Dec. 13, 1948: Very Rev. Msgrs. John J. Voight and John J. Curry, of the Archdiocese of New York; and James E. Cowhig and John S. Spence, of the Archdiocese of Washington.

Jan. 12, 1949: Very Rev. Msgr. Henry J. Vogelpohl, of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati.

Feb. 1, 1949: Very Rev. Msgrs. Henry Grigsby and Joseph P. Kiefer, of the Diocese of Steubenville.

Feb. 17, 1949: Very Rev. Msgrs. Raymond L. Harbaugh and Leonard A. Bauer, of the Diocese of Belleville.

March 9, 1949: Very Rev. Msgrs. John J. Cody, Joseph J. Grellner, Anthony L. Meyers, and Ignatius J. Strecker, of the Diocese of Wichita.

April 30, 1949: Very Rev. Msgrs. Joseph F. Cleary, John F. Hackett, and Joseph R. Lacy, of the Diocese of Hartford; and Edmund J. Goebel and Leonard W. Lieven, of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee.

May 20, 1949: Very Rev. Msgrs. Matthew A. Howard and Joseph E. McGlynn, of the Diocese of Columbus.

May 30, 1949: Very Rev. Msgr. Howard Smith, of the Diocese of Fargo.

Honorary Chamberlain in abito paonazzo ["in purple habit"]:

June 19, 1949: Very Rev. Msgr. Celestine J. Damiano, of the Diocese of Buffalo.

Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, military class:

Jan. 18, 1946: Lt. Col. Robert Martin, U.S.A.

Knights of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:

Jan. 28, 1949: Emmet Joseph Culligan, Richard E. Dowd, Francis X. Fiegel, and Leroy E. Goodbody, of the Diocese of San Diego.

April 30, 1949: William A. Reiss and August Reisweber, of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee.

Commander with Plaque of the Order of Pius:

Aug. 18, 1949: Frank J. Lewis, of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

Commander with Plaque of the Order of St. Gregory the Great;

June 21, 1949: Augustine T. Wehrle, of the Diocese of Columbus.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Book Reviews

MARIA. ÉTUDES SUR LA SAINTE VIERGE. Sous la direction d'Hubert du Manoir, S.J. Vol. I. Paris: Beauchesne, 1949. Pp. 919.

In an enlightening introduction the editor tells us that this monumental work is meant as a synthesis of Mariological thought for the faithful and the clergy. Really, it will be a mine of information about the Mother of God. There will be three volumes in all. This first volume deals with Mary in Scripture, in patristic literature, in the various liturgies, in spirituality and the apostolate. The second volume will treat of the Marian cult in Religious Orders and Congregations, and among the clergy. The third volume will be a summary of Marian cult in the various countries of the world. It is to be regretted that the article on the Immaculate Conception could not have been included in the first volume where it belongs logically, even though the editor explains that its postponement was unavoidable. Likewise, the marriage between Mary and Joseph deserves more than a passing treatment in "Mary and the Family."

The twenty-seven articles that make up the first volume are written by as many different experts. The name alone of some of them is guarantee of a scholarly treatment. "The Holy Virgin in the Old Testament" was done by A. Robert, P.S.S. This is the least satisfying of all the articles. The explanation of the texts is too brief to be convincing. The author follows many modern scholars when he rejects Jer. 31:22 as Marian; but there are still some scholars who claim when all is said and done there is some Messianic content in this passage. In the light of tradition and of the contents, we cannot agree that Ps. 44 and Canticle do not speak of Mary in a Scriptural sense, or that Gen. 3:15 speaks of Mary only as pre-figured in Eve. His notes on this text are inspired too much by the superficial, incomplete, much criticized, doctoral dissertation of L. Drewniak; and his interpretations do not harmonize with those of other authors in this same volume.

"The Holy Virgin in the New Testament," written by Canon G. Hilion, is really a short life of Mary with the theological doctrines interwoven. It is quite complete in the choice of passages and accurate in the treatment of details. But we miss at least a word on Apoc. 12, which a number of the other authors rightly hold to be Marian.

Canon G. Jouassard wrote the long article on Mary in patristic literature, in which he specializes on the divine maternity, the virginity and the holiness of Mary. It is in general a critically careful analysis of the ancient Christian writers. The author does not hesitate to point

out cases in which the Fathers do not teach the common doctrine of their day, or doctrines that were later approved by the Church. But he is mistaken in thinking that there are no decisive proofs in Irenaeus that Mary remained a virgin after the Annunciation and throughout her life.

The well-known J. Daniélou, S.J., in the excursus on the Marian cult in paganism, rightly concludes that the Christian dogma on the Virgin Mother of God does not come from the pagan cults of the goddesses, but that this does not exclude the probability that the pagan cults occasioned the substitution of some aspects in Marian cult. In a second excursus J. M. Abd-el-Jalil, O.F.M., writes on the life of Mary in the Coran and Islam.

Book two, on Mary and the Liturgy, reveals how much Mary was in the limelight of all the liturgies. The liturgy of the West receives an authoritative treatment at the hands of Dom Capelle, O.S.B.; the prominence of the Virgin Mother in the Byzantine liturgy is emphasized by S. Salaville, A.A.; the Syro-Maronite, the Chaldean, the Armenian, the Ethiopian liturgies all receive individual attention by M. Deumith, A. M. Massonnat, O.P., Vartan Tekeyan, and G. Nollet, respectively. An article on the Coptic liturgy is promised for the third volume.

In book three, on Mary in dogma and theology, the first article is on the universal mediation of Mary by E. Druwé, S.J. This 155 page article is undoubtedly one of the best. It is clear in its presentation, scholarly in its method, thorough in its discussion of all the problems involved and the arguments advanced. The author correctly stresses the value of the traditional notion of Mary as the New Eve, the Consort of Christ, a notion that has its Scriptural basis in Gen. 3:15 and Apoc. 12. In keeping with the authentic documents of the Popes, he defends a proximate, objective cooperation of Mary in the work of the redemption. The intrinsic nature of this cooperation he explains by saying that she not only merited and satisfied together with Christ but did so by way of sacrifice. Appealing to Scheeben he asserts that Mary as type and ideal of the universal priesthood was the representative of the whole race at the cross and was co-offerer of the Sacrifice, which is Christ.

The spiritual motherhood of Mary is ably treated by Th. Koehler, Marianist. The royalty of Mary is briefly but adequately sketched by the famous Mariologist, G. M. Roschini, O.S.M. However, in using Ps. 44 as a proof for Mary's queenship it would have been the part of a scholar to note in what sense it is to be taken, as was done for the Canticle. Because of the full context of III Kings 2:19-20 not all authors would allow even an accommodation for the mediation of Mary, much less a strict Scriptural sense, as the author does.

M. Jugie, A.A., well known for his voluminous book on the Assumption, gives here a kind of summary of that larger work. He again defends the opinion that the Assumption can be defined but not the death of Mary for which there is neither historical nor theological certitude. On that, of course, he has been given more than enough opposition. As Scriptural basis for the Assumption he again stresses Apoc. 12, but also mentions Gen. 3:15 in passing.

A master interpreter of Marian Scripture texts, J. M. Bover, S.J., has an interesting article on Mary and the Church: both are the New Eve, both are the Mother of Abraham's posterity, both are the Woman of Apoc. 12. There is really only one maternity, which pertains jointly to Mary and the Church, even though both do not realize it in the same manner; and Mary's motherhood is the primary and principal one.

C. Crivelli, S.J., deals with "Our Lady and the Protestants." René Laurentin writes on "The Initial Problem of Marian Methodology." He discusses two general attitudes among Mariologists. To one group he claims belong the "critical"; to the other, the "devout" or "mystic." This classification is unhistorical and superficial. Among Catholic theologians hardly any were or are critics without a rather strong devotion to Mary, and very few were or are blind devotees of Mary without a love for the truth. The author seems to style "critics" those who oppose a doctrine that would ascribe greater dignity to Mary, on pretense of a more careful analysis of the problem and the arguments, and "mystics" those who wish to honor Mary with the greater dignity and are therefore, supposedly, not too critical. But why should Fr. Lennerz be considered a "critic" if he waters down the pronouncements of the popes on the coredemption, as if he loved Mary less? And why should Fr. Carol be branded a "mystic" if, with the majority by far of scholars, he takes the popes' words at face value, as if he were therefor less accurate? Will not history bear out the assertion that the "mystics" were proved right in the past? They, then, were the true "critics," because the question is not whether one is a miserly "critic" or an enthusiastic "mystic" on some Mariologic tenet, but whether he holds the true doctrine obtained from the sound theological sources of revelation. His devotion can be a great asset to him, but is not an objective criterion of the truth of his tenet.

M. J. Nicolas, O.P., presents a penetrating analysis and concise synthesis on "The Marian Synthesis," in which he rightly stresses the virginal motherhood of Mary as the central and unifying doctrine of all Mariology. We think, however, that the doctrine of Mary's Absolute Primacy in creation, together with Christ, is so far advanced today that no complete and adequate synthesis of Marian theology can afford to omit it.

L. Reypens, S.J., gives an enlightening and sober exposition of Mary's knowledge and her place in mysticism. A timely paper on Mary and the family is written by S. de Lestapis, and one on Mary's part in labor by Canon P. Glorieux. M. P. Pourrat, P.S.S., treats the delicate topic of Mary and the priesthood quite well. He concludes that Mary may, historically and doctrinally, be considered as sharing in Christ's priesthood, even though the *devotion* to Mary as Virgin Priest has been disapproved. In a rather lengthy article, G. Geenen, O.P., gives a splendid account of the doctrinal and historical antecedents of the consecration of the world to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. P. Lorson, S.J., gives a brief narration of the part Mary played in the conversion of some converts; and Msgr. H. Chappoulie has a few pages on the missions and Marian spirituality. The final article is on Mary and Catholic Action by Bishop Richaud of Laval.

With few exceptions, the articles have appended an up-to-date bibliography. The readers will appreciate the fact that most of the authors used arabic numbers in the references. The editor should have made all conform. In this streamline age there is little excuse for the long and clumsy Roman figures (cf. p. 27), especially in such a large work where everything should be brief. For the rest both the editor and the publisher deserve congratulations on the altogether excellent format and print. The reviewer feels confident that those who read this volume will anxiously await the other volumes.

DOMINIC J. UNGER, O.F.M. CAP.

MANUAL OF SOLEMN CEREMONIES FOR ALTAR BOYS. By Rev. James J. Doherty. Chicago: J. S. Paluch Co., 1949. Pp. 79.

Fr. Doherty has assembled in this little *brochure* the pertinent directions for altar boys who assist as minor officers at solemn functions. The ceremonies described are only solemn ones, i.e. those performed with the assistance of deacon and subdeacon. We note, by the way, that the author speaks of "Solemn High Mass." This designation, though very commonly heard, seems to us a tautological expression, since when a Mass is solemn it is also *a fortiori* high. The ceremonies are divided for each function into those to be observed by master of ceremonies, acolytes, and thurifer. In addition to Solemn Mass, both usual and Requiem, and Solemn Benediction, the book covers the ceremonies of Holy Week, from Palm Sunday to Holy Saturday.

The directions are, in general, quite accurate. By an evident *lapsus calami,* the master of ceremonies is told to put the incense into the censer for the incensation at the Elevations at the *Nobis quoque peccatoribus,* when it is the *Hanc igitur* that is meant (p. 30). No provi-

sion is made in the book for the altar boy to accompany the deacon for the incensation or the subdeacon for the *Pax* when Mass is sung with clergy *in choro*. Incensing of the Blessed Sacrament at the actual moment of blessing at Benediction, while in accord with the Roman practice, is not universally the custom in this country (p. 39).

These and similar minor defects, however, do nothing to neutralize the value of the little manual as a convenient handbook for altar boys.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

MY CATHOLIC FAITH. By the Most Rev. Louis L. Morrow, D.D. Kenosha, Wisconsin: My Mission House, 1949. Pp. 416. $3.00.

This book is intended by its distinguished author, the Bishop of Krishnagar, India, to provide a text of Catholic doctrine for the pupils of secondary schools and colleges, and to serve as a layman's manual of theology. It is abundantly illustrated, thus justifying its secondary title: *A Catechism in Pictures*. Some of the illustrations are quite elaborate especially the one which depicts the various colors of the vestments, with a chart explaining their use throughout the ecclesiastical year. The text is presented in the form of questions and answers, and embraces 193 lessons.

Following the general plan of the catechism, the work is divided into three sections, concerned with the creed, the commandments, and the sacraments respectively. As the author states in the preface, the recently published Confraternity edition of the Baltimore Catechism has been used extensively. However, there is much additional matter of a most practical nature. Thus, entire lessons have been devoted to such topics as Catholic Action, Church and State, Capital and Labor, Divorce, the Dignity of the Priesthood, and Church Symbolism. The scriptural texts incorporated into the answers are numerous and well-chosen.

The book contains an excellent index, and also an appendix with the most important prayers approved by the Catholic Church, including a number of indulgenced ejaculations. There is also a table of the principal feasts of the Church year, with a brief explanation of the significance of each.

There are some mistakes which we hope will be corrected in a future edition. Thus, on p. 254 the matter of the Sacrament of Holy Orders is given as "the instrument proper for each rank"—a statement which is not in harmony with the recent decision of Pope Pius XII. An assertion on p. 341 is not sufficiently qualified—namely, that "if, upon contracting marriage, a couple agree not to have children, although with the intention to use marital rights, their marriage is null, invalid, no

marriage." And on p. 349 it is stated that in the event of a mixed marriage "the non-Catholic signs a written promise not to endanger the faith of the Catholic spouse and to have all the children born of the union reared as Catholics," whereas the law of the Church requires both parties to guarantee the Catholic baptism and education of the offspring (Canon 1061).

Despite these defects, *My Catholic Faith* is an excellent explanation of the Church's teaching, adapted to provide the laity with a very adequate knowledge of Catholic theology, as Bishop Morrow has intended it to be.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

THE RICHES OF THE MISSAL. By Jean Vagaggini, O.S.B. Translated by C. Cornelia Craigie. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1949. Pp. 319. $4.00.

The idea behind this book is excellent: to give a deeper understanding and a better appreciation of the spiritual wealth that is contained in the sacred Liturgy, particularly as embodied in the Roman Missal. And the author has developed this idea in quite a commendable manner. Not only does he treat of the meaning and immense value of the liturgical Sacrifice as such; he also quotes at length many of the antiphons, orations and Scriptural readings of the Missal, to show how those who really "live the Liturgy" can hardly fail to grow in closer union with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. Worthy of special mention is the large amount of space given here to the social teachings of Christianity as exemplified in the text of the Missal.

The formal division of this work along the traditional lines of the purgative, the illuminative, and the unitive way, etc., should not frighten one into thinking that this may be a dry-as-dust treatment of ascetical theology. The only harm of such a division is that it leads the author into many needless repetitions. After all, many of the orations and Biblical passages of the Missal can naturally be applied equally well to any one of these "ways." Far from being a formal treatise on ascetical theology, this book is composed in a rambling sort of way, and its author does not hesitate to wander off into fields which are but distantly related to the subjects of the various chapters.

It is gratifying to note how numerous and extensive are the passages from the Bible which the author quotes. But at times he seems to have rather hazy notions about certain parts of the Old Testament. For instance, on page 46 he says, "The high priests of the Old Law entered once a year into the holy of holies, after sprinkling themselves with the

blood of calves and of goats, mingled with the ashes of a heifer. The Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of it. . . ." A similar statement is made on page 29. But surely the author misunderstands Heb. 9:11-14, to which he is referring. The 16th chapter of Leviticus is the only place in the Old Testament that gives the rubrics for the Day of Atonement, when the high priest purified the holy of holies once a year. On this occasion he sprinkled several sacred objects with blood, but not *himself;* and "the ashes of a heifer" had nothing at all to do with this ceremony. The purpose of these ashes, as explained in the 19th chapter of Numbers, was for the purification of anyone who became legally impure by touching a corpse; moreover, they were mixed with water, not with blood. As if this confusion of Old Testament data were not enough, on the same page 46 the author says, "Moses received an order from God to deliver his people from the hands of the Egyptians after seventy years of captivity." Now, there may be a little difficulty in harmonizing St. Stephen's statement in Acts 7:6, that the Israelites were "four hundred years" in Egypt, with the statement in Exodus 12:40, that they were there for "four hundred and thirty years"; but it is only complicating matters to try to make their stay in Egypt as short as the seventy years of their captivity in Babyon a thousand years later.

However, even though the author may not be entirely at home in the Old Testament, he is quite reliable in his own field, the spiritual teachings of the Missal. Here he can be read with pleasure and profit by the clergy as well as by the laity. And unfortunately he has found an excellent translator. The English runs so smoothly that the reader would hardly suspect that this work was originally written in another language. If this good quality is combined with genuine fidelity to the thoughts of the original, which cannot be checked at present, the translator is deserving of no small meed of praise.

LOUIS HARTMAN, C.SS.R.

MEDITATION AND ACTIVITY

But it remains true that the men who did most to bring souls to God, to awaken in them a desire to turn to God and abandon their sins, to strive towards perfection, were just the very men who knew how to seek the solitude required for serious prayer. In order to see the world aright, we have to stand back and examine it.

—Robert Nash, S.J., in *The Priest at his Prie-Dieu* (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1949), p. 118.